

POPE,  
WARBURTON  
AND THE KNAPTONS:  
PROBLEMS OF  
LITERARY LEGACY

[WITH A BOOK-TRADE CORRESPONDENCE]

DONALD WINGATE NICHOL

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

1984



To my parents

Ev & Walt

'in duty both equally bound'



## Abstract

Alexander Pope's association with William Warburton is unique in literary history, yet its consequences have rarely been explored in relation to the book trade. Never before had a poet been able to support himself on earnings derived from the sale of books; it follows that Pope was the first writer to pass on a literary estate of any financial value in his will. To this end, he chose an editor and actively engaged him in the preparation of 'the Great Edition of my things with your Notes'. Between 1751 and 1754 some 10,750 sets of Pope's Works were published by John and Paul Knapton, a figure which soars beyond the statistical when we consider at least a couple of these furnished the libraries of Gibbon and Byron.

I begin by examining the way Pope's works were presented and editorial contingencies. I then look at patronage and Pope's correspondence with his editor. Critics as eminent as Sir Leslie Stephen and F.W. Bateson have regarded Warburton's editorial treatment of Pope's works with disdain, yet if we count the attacks on Warburton we must realize the immense burden that accompanied Pope's legacy. The 1751 Works will then be viewed from various perspectives with emphasis given to the textual problems which still affect the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot. My last chapter treats the problems facing booksellers in the mid eighteenth century. Little academic due has been paid to the Knaptons. To remedy this, I have compiled an array of documents - correspondence; ledgers; bank accounts; auction records; wills - which I hope will broaden our knowledge of the day-to-day operations of the book trade.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title/Dedication/Abstract/Acknowledgements/Short Titles  
and Abbreviations/List of Illustrations/Frontispieces/&c.

I	Introducing Alexander Pope Esq.:	
	Authors, Editors and Booksellers	1
II	Pope, Warburton and 'the Great Edition of my things with your Notes'	53
III	Attacks on the Editor: 'Together with his Works, he hath bequeathed me his DUNCES'	117
IV	The 1751 <u>Works</u> :	
	Background of an Edition	191
V	Pope's Posthumous Booksellers:	
	Problems in the Book Trade	269

### Appendices:

A	A Book-Trade Correspondence	341
B	Abstracts of Accounts for Pope's Works	441
C	Warburton's and the Knaptons' Accounts with Gosling's Bank	456
D	The Knapton Auction Records	474
E	Births, Imprints and Wills	483
F	Pope's 1747 <u>Ethic Epistles</u> : an unrecorded edition	492

	Select Bibliography	506
--	---------------------	-----

	A Closing Note on the Knaptons and the <u>ESTC</u>	522
--	--	-----

	Tailpiece: Strahan Ornaments in the 1752 <u>Works</u>	523
--	---	-----

## Acknowledgements

Various individuals and institutions have helped me over the past five years. Without funding from the Senatus Postgraduate Studies Committee of the University of Edinburgh none of my research would have been possible. The Canadian Centennial Scholarship Fund helped me in the latter stages.

Many members of the Department of English Literature at Edinburgh have been particularly helpful. Professor K.J. Fielding has gone to more trouble on my behalf than I care to remind him of (and for which I am truly grateful); Dr Jonquil Bevan helped uncomplicate bibliographical matters; Geoffrey Carnall, Macdonald Emslie and Dr Michael Phillips have been abiding influences; Colin Nicholson has animated many Augustan discussions; and Dr John Valdimir Price has ushered this thesis from its inchoate stages to its present state with patience and aplomb. Other members of the department and colleagues I would like to thank en masse.\*

Margot Butt has been more than kind in allowing me to peruse the library and correspondence of her late husband, without whose devotion and fine scholarship the Twickenham edition would not exist. Dr J.D. Fleeman gave me an invaluable suggestion for my research on the Knaptons which, in turn, leads me to thank Mr Kenneth Roberts of Barclays Bank (Goslings Branch) for a couple of days' access to the Knapton account. Robert M. Ryley has sent part of his typescript for his forthcoming book on Warburton from New York; and Keith

---

\*I owe a special debt of thanks to Milly, Jill, Sheila and Linda for helping me with technical details.

Maslen has forwarded photocopies of the Bowyer ledgers from Dunedin. Dr Tom Henighan has given me an extended overseas loan of his copy of Pope's 1735 Works.

David Foxon, James McLaverty, Michael Treadwell, Sarah Brewer and Michael B. Thompson have all been helpful correspondents. Many librarians have assisted me in my sometimes weighty requests. I would like to thank, in particular, Dr Hall (EUL); Dr Ann Matheson and Kate Davidson of the National Library of Scotland; J.L. Wood and M.J. Jannetta of the British Library; Dr J.A. Edwards of the University of Reading Library (who forwarded the Knapton sale records); and Dr B.S. Benedikz of the University of Birmingham Library.

To my friends who have put me up, fed me and otherwise supported me on Pope rambles, I would like to thank Phil Sheldrake, Catherine Mellen, James and Alma Cullen, Wesley Wark, Christine Bold, Nan Martin, Steve Ellis, Jo, David Ketterer and Anita &c.&c. Robin Fincham has been a great help during the final stages; Tom Bell has been my trusty accomptant; Jagna Oltarzewska has translated French and Latin passages for me; Peter and Gilly have put up with my nocturnal typings. Angus Calder has given me the opportunity to broaden my knowledge of the Enlightenment; Roy Porter gave me a memorable lunch. Finally I would like to thank my uncle, Dr Charles Adam Nichol, who has kindly sent Pope tomes from America, and my parents to whom this is dedicated.



## The AUTHOR to the READER

On proofreading my chapters I have noticed in my footnotes I have used the blunt monosyllable 'Corr.' where I rely heavily on Sherburn's edition and resort to the more polite 'Correspondence' at less repetitious times; similarly, I have adopted 'Guerinot' in times of peace and 'Pamphlet Attacks' in times of war. I hope the reader will not be overly irritated by these inconsistencies.

All dates are given in the modern sense, with the year running from January to December (e.g. 14 February 1738/9 will be <sup>St</sup>Valentine's Day 1739). No adjustments have been made to accommodate for the eleven missing days between Wednesday 2 September 1752 (the last day of the Julian calendar) and Thursday 14 September 1752 (the next day which was the first day of our Gregorian calendar). Dates from Sherburn's Correspondence are given as they appear.

In our advanced years of decimalization, it may not be remiss of me to remind that reader of the following conversions: 12 pennies (12d.) = 1 shilling (1s.); 20 <sup>s</sup>shillings (20s.) = 1 pounds (£1); and 21 shillings (21s.) = 1 guinea. Multiplication factors (to bring home the value of eighteenth-century items, like books) vary from twenty to sixty. Pat Rogers gives the lower figure in his Oxford Standard Authors edition of Pope's Poetical Works (1978; p. xiv); Roy Porter recommends the higher number in his 1982 English Society in the Eighteenth Century.

It remains for me to declare: I have composed all of this thesis, and that any errors are my own.

30 April 1984



Warburton: a chronology

- 1698 born in Newark, son of a town-clerk (24 Dec.)
- 1714 articled to an attorney for five years (23 Apr.)
- 1719 probably practised law in Newark
- 1723 ordained deacon by Archbishop of York (22 Dec.); also published first book of miscellaneous Latin translations, dedicated to Sir Robert Sutton
- 1727 Sutton obtained for Warburton the living of Greaseley; Warburton ordained priest (1 Mar.); Legal Judicature
- 1728 M.A. awarded by Cambridge through Sutton's influence; Warburton corresponding with Theobald, Concanen, Stukeley, des Maizeaux, Birch, et al
- 1732 An Apology for Sir R. Sutton
- 1736 Alliance between Church and State
- 1737 Divine Legation of Moses, pt. i
- 1738 Warburton begins vindication of Pope
- 1739 A Vindication of Mr. Pope's Essay on Man
- 1740 first meeting of Pope and Warburton (Apr.)
- 1741 Divine Legation, pt. ii (books vii-viii never finished)
- 1742 wrote supplement for Jarvis's Don Quixote
- 1744 death of Pope (30 May); Warburton became literary executor; manuscripts and unprinted papers under Bolingbroke's and Marchmont's care
- 1746 married Gertrude Tucker; became preacher at Lincoln's Inn
- 1747 edition of Shakespeare in 8 vols octavo
- 1749 A Letter to the Editor of the Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism
- 1750 Julian
- 1751 edition of Pope in 9 vols octavo
- 1760 consecrated Bishop of Gloucester (20 Jan.)
- 1779 died (11 June)



## Short Titles and Abbreviations

<u>Anecdotes</u>	Joseph Spence, <u>Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men</u> , edited by James M. Osborn, 2 volumes (Oxford, 1966)
<u>BJECS</u>	<u>British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies</u>
Butt	<u>The Poems of Alexander Pope</u> , edited by John Butt, one-volume Twickenham (London, 1963; rpt. 1977)
<u>Correspondence [Corr.]</u>	<u>The Correspondence of Alexander Pope</u> , edited by George Sherburn, 5 vols (Oxford, 1956)
<u>DNB</u>	<u>Dictionary of National Biography</u>
Evans	A. W. Evans, <u>Warburton and the Warburtonians</u> (Oxford, 1932)
Foxon	David Foxon, <u>English Verse 1701-1750: a catalogue of separately printed poems</u> , 2 vols (Cambridge, 1975)
<u>GM</u>	<u>Gentleman's Magazine</u> [1731-]
Griffith	Reginald Harvey Griffith, <u>Alexander Pope: a bibliography</u> , 2 vols (Austin, 1922-27)
Guerinot	J.V. Guerinot, <u>Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope 1711-1744: a descriptive bibliography</u> (London, 1969)
Nichols	John Nichols, <u>Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century</u> , 6 vols (London, 1812)
O.B.S.	Oxford Bibliographical Society occasional publications
<u>PBSA</u>	<u>Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America</u>
Pope	<u>Works</u> (1717; 1735; 1751- as indicated)
Twickenham	<u>The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope</u> , general editor, John Butt, 11 vols in 12 (London, 1939-69) [see bibliography for individual volumes]
Watson	John Selby Watson, <u>The Life of William Warburton</u> (London, 1863)
Wimsatt	William Kurtz Wimsatt, Jr., <u>The Portraits of Alexander Pope</u> (New Haven, Conn., 1974)

List of Illustrations and Documents

1717 folding frontispiece (reduced)	preface
1717 <u>Works</u>	"
1735 <u>Works</u>	"
1720 <u>Miscellaneous Poems and Translations</u>	"
1751 <u>Works</u>	"
1770 <u>Works</u>	"

\*

1751 frontispiece	212
1734/35 <u>Arbuthnot</u> , page 15: Pope's 'P'?	232
Warburton's Cancelled Page: Elwin/Courthope <u>Works</u> III (1881), 534-35	243
1751 plate XVII: before and after	260

\*

Warburton's Sun Fire Policy	396
Warburton's letter to Robert Dodsley 26 December 1755 (reduced)	435
The Knapton Account with Bowyer (Maslen 552)	455
A Catalogue of Books in Quires, and Copies: Knapton's Sale, 25 September 1755	478-482
1747 <u>Ethic Epistles</u> : an unrecorded edition	492
1752 Strahan Ornaments: tailpiece	523

\*



Mr. Pope

After the original by Sir Godfrey Kneller

T H E  
W O R K S  
O F  
Mr. ALEXANDER POPE.

---

VOLUME II.

---

CICERO pro ARCH.

*Hæc studia adolescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant; secundas  
res ornant, adversis perfugium & solatium præbent; delectant  
domi, non impediunt foris; pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinan-  
tur, rusticantur.*



L O N D O N :

Printed by J. WRIGHT, for LAWTON GILLIVER at *Homer's*  
Head in *Fleetstreet*, MDCCLXXXV.





THE  
WORKS

# OF

Alexander Pope Esq.

**In Nine Volumes Complete.**

WITH HIS LAST

CORRECTIONS, ADDITIONS,

**A·N·D**

## IMPROVEMENTS:

As they were delivered to the EDITOR a little before his Death :

TOGETHER WITH THE

COMMENTARIES and NOTES  
OF

**OFF**

MR. WARBURTON

LONDON,

Printed for J. and P. KNAPTON, H. LINTOT,  
J. and R. TONSON, and S. DRAPER.

M D C C L I.

# I

## INTRODUCING ALEXANDER POPE ESQ.

### AUTHORS, EDITORS AND BOOKSELLERS

In most senses Pope is the epitome of the modern writer. Whatever sprung from his mind through his pen and onto paper was put to good professional use. He wrote his own original poems in various genres, imitations, translations; he edited the works of other writers; he collaborated for the theatre; he turned correspondence into a lucrative sideline; and he reviewed for the Guardian. He even churned out the occasional piece of mock-heroic advertising copy:

Aw'd, on my bended knees I fell,  
Receiv'd the weapons of the sky;  
And dipt them in the sable Well,  
The fount of Fame or Infamy.

"What well? what weapon? (Flavia cries)  
"A standish, steel and golden pen;  
"It came from Bertrand's, not the skies;  
"I gave it you to write again.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>, On receiving from the Right Hon. the Lady Frances Shirley a standish and two pens', Twickenham VI, 378.



If diversity of talents is the common coinage of professional writers like Anthony Burgess, Erica Jong and Clive James, Pope was the first to mint it. There are various reasons for Pope becoming the first writer to support himself on earnings derived from the sale of books. He had the mixed blessing of being born in 1688 - bad if you were a Roman Catholic, good if you wanted to become a professional writer. Had he been born (as Milton was) in 1608, he never would have made a livelihood from selling books. As Philip Gaskell points out, Milton was fortunate to receive any payment at all for the copyright to Paradise Lost; in fact, his bookseller was generous in promising an additional five pounds for the second edition, 'a sort of royalty agreement'.<sup>2</sup>

Dryden helped cast the mould of the professional man of letters, but most of his income came from patronage, not publishing. The combined amounts of his laureateship, his position as Historiographer Royal and box-office returns brought him up to an average income of about £500 per annum. After losing his positions in the wake of the Glorious Revolution, he was forced to turn to producing and publishing. The later financial arrangements he made with Jacob Tonson for his translation of Virgil helped pave the way for Pope's Homer. In turn, Jacob Tonson proved how success-

<sup>2</sup> Philip Gaskell, A New Introduction to Bibliography (Oxford, 1972), p. 183.

ful the subscription method could be. Dryden's profits for the Aeneid were between £1200 and £1400 with a mere 350 subscribers. Encouraged by this coup, Tonson paid Dryden 250 guineas for 12,000 lines of the Fables shortly before the poet's death in 1700. The selling of books, as Tonson knew, was becoming a propitious means of gainful employment. The financial enhancement of the author's position was not altogether easy. Pat Rogers notes the different kinds of friction which could occur between writer and bookseller: '[Dryden's] quarrels with Jacob Tonson were generally about money, whereas Pope's with his publishers were generally about copyright, confidentiality or quasi-moral issues.'<sup>3</sup> Still, for the most part, the connection between publishing one's own works and profiting from their sales was only narrowly perceived.

Pope's meeting with Dryden may have been apocryphal, but the old poet gave Pope (apart from the pre-Dunciad Mac Flecknoe) the idea that a living was to be made out of translations. Not only would Pope make his fortune on Homer, but he would also acquire the knack of coming out on top by setting two booksellers - like Tonson and Lintot - in competition. This was made more possible by the growing number of booksellers in London; according to Rogers, there were about fifty at the height of Dryden's career in 1680,

<sup>3</sup> Pat Rogers, 'Books, Readers and Patrons', in the New Pelican Guide to English Literature: from Dryden to Johnson, edited by Boris Ford, revised edition (1982), IV, 214-27; p. 223. Figures in this paragraph have been taken from Rogers.

one hundred when Pope first began to publish in 1709, one hundred and fifty at the time of his death in 1744 and more than two hundred when Dr Johnson died in 1784.<sup>4</sup>

From the start Pope couldn't help but be an outsider. The only son of his father's second wife, he entered the world in the same year William of Orange entered London. Pope's upbringing was to more than a slight extent determined by the anti-Catholic legislation brought about in 1688. His parents moved from city to suburb to country. Binfield provided the backdrop for his poetic wanderlust, and Windsor Forest offered him much more than a title to one of his early creations. As idyllic as his youth must have been, his adolescence was marred by the disease which affected him for the rest of his life. Reading perhaps was his greatest escape; if he could not run with the others, he might outwit them with words. The ironies of his situation must have been painfully apparent to him. No matter how brilliant he was he would not be permitted to attend university - and when offered an honorary degree towards the end of his life he was forced to decline it because Warburton's was withheld. No matter how witty he was there would be some envious hack to jeer at his deformity. No matter how attached he was to his closest friends he could not visit them when they lived abroad. And no matter how

<sup>4</sup>Rogers, 'Books, Readers and Patrons', p. 216.

amorous he might feel no woman would ever become his wife. If ever a writer had any cause to be bitter Pope had. The remarkable thing is that he was able to use bitterness rather than be consumed by it. His satire is perhaps more difficult to come to terms with than Swift's because he remained so stoical about his condition. Catholicism fortified his sense of identity as a writer. It is in a way appropriate that one of humanity's clinging survivors should pen the Essay on Man.

Being born in 1688 meant that Pope would turn twenty-one in 1709, the year in which the new copyright act was passed. Its full title reads: 'An Act for the Encouragement of Learning by vesting Copies of printed Books in the Authors of Purchasers of such Copies during the Times therein mentioned.' Replacing the Licensing Act of 1662, the new Act of Anne (which came into effect in April 1710) cleared up some of the legal ambiguities, although the lobbying booksellers failed to get exactly what they wished. Authors now had ownership of their works, new rights:

In regard to works already published, it [the new Act] provided that all owners of copyrights (authors or publishers or their assigns) should retain their rights for 21 years, i.e. until 1731. In regard to unpublished works, the rule was that the author retained sole rights for 14 years as from the date of first publication, the period being extended by a further 14 years if the author was still alive at the end of *the first* 14. New works had to be entered in the

Stationers' Register as before.<sup>5</sup>

The copyright act did not make careers overnight; or, as Ian Watt has suggested, it was not the 'Magna Carta of Authorship'.<sup>6</sup> Yet, in the case of Pope, the synchronism of his poetical coming of age with the 1709/10 Act should not be overlooked. Would Pope have been able to exact such phenomenal profits from the subscription to his Homer translation in the first decade of the passing of the Act?

Gaskell points out that Pope was the first notable beneficiary of the copyright act:

This immediately enabled a popular author to obtain, in one way or another, substantial payment for his work—Pope for instance got more than £5000 for the first edition of his translation of the Iliad (1715-20). . . and the eighteenth century saw the development of various forms of agreement between author and publisher. Outright sale of copyright continued to be very common, but the prices given to popular authors rose steadily as the century progressed: Swift got £200 for Gulliver's travels in 1726, Fielding £1,000 for Amelia in 1752, and William Robertson the huge sum of £4,500 for The history of Charles V in 1769. Alternatively copyright might be leased for a limited period of time—Pope was paid £200 for a year's lease of the Essay on man, 1733—or for a particular edition; or the author and publisher might agree to

<sup>5</sup>Victor Bonham-Carter, Authors by Profession (London, 1978), I, 16.

<sup>6</sup>Ian Watt, 'Publishers and Sinners: the Augustan view', Studies in Bibliography (1959), XII, 3-20; p. 13.

share the profits, with or without a  
reversion of the copyright to the author.<sup>7</sup>

The Act then had a considerable effect on the economic structure of the book trade. For the first time literary property became a going concern for the author. Recognition in the form of financial consideration was given to the fact that<sup>already</sup> appeared on the title-page of the product: the author's name was more prominent than the bookseller's imprint. Without the author there would be no text. Or, put another way, the person who oversaw the actual production of a book was dependent upon the person who came up with the idea for the book, usually in the form of a manuscript. The new Act acknowledged this role, and the professional man of letters stepped into eminence.

The difference between the book as a conveyor of ideas and the book as a mass-produced item is satirically pointed out in John Gay's The What d'ye Call it, first produced in 1715. The prisoner Peascod is handed a book and told to repent:

\_\_\_\_\_I will, I will.  
Lend me thy handkercher—The Pilgrim's pro\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ [Reads and weeps.  
(I cannot see for tears) Pro—Progress—Oh!  
The Pilgrim's Progress—eighth—edi—ti—on  
Lon-don-prin-ted—for—Ni-cho-las Bod-ding-ton:  
With new ad-di-tions never made before.

<sup>7</sup>Gaskell, A New Introduction to Bibliography, p. 184.



Oh! 'tis so moving, I can read no more.  
[Drops the book.]<sup>8</sup>

The Peascods of the world were beginning to read (if only the imprint - and that, slowly - on the cover). Gay's audience might laugh at his ignorance or his reticence over turning the page of Bunyan's book, although they themselves might only have recently acquired this ability let alone the book. What I'm trying to suggest is there was, along with the burgeoning of a book business, an ironic awareness of the inception and manufacture of books.

A year before Gay's play was first performed, Pope entertained the town with the expanded version of the Rape of the Lock. Originally published in the 1712 Miscellaneous Poems and Translations, the two-canto Rape earned Pope a mere £7 on 21 March. Going against Addison's advice, Pope revised it, animated it with sylphs and had it advertised as such:

In a few Days will be publish'd, The Rape  
 of the Lock; an Heroick-Comical Poem; by  
 Mr. POPE now first publish'd complete in 5  
 Cantos; with 6 Copper Plates: Price 1s. . . .  
 There will be a small Number. . . printed  
 on fine Paper; those who are willing to have  
 These, are desired to send in their Names to  
 Bernard Lintott. . .<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup>Burlesque Plays of the Eighteenth Century, edited by Simon Trussler (Oxford, 1969), p. 77 [Act II scene i].

<sup>9</sup>Cited from Tillotson's introduction in Twickenham II, 103. The advertisement appeared in the Post Boy, 26-28 January 1714.

In the Rape of the Lock, books play a part in furnishing the scenes as well as the motivations of the characters. Crammed together on one of Belinda's toilet shelves are:

Puffs, Powders, Patches, Bibles, Billet-doux.  
[I. 138]

Holy writ has now become lost in the plurality of Belinda's world of cosmetic surfaces. As Tillotson suggests, her Bibles may have been given as presents ornamentally bound with clasps in petite duodecimos. Instead of prayer-books, 'It may have been more fashionable in 1714 to carry Bibles'.<sup>10</sup> The covetous Baron not only cried to heaven for his prize:

But chiefly Love—to Love an Altar built,  
Of twelve vast French Romances, neatly gilt.  
[II. 37-38]

Later, when Clarissa passes him the 'glitt'ring Forfex', a similar reference is made: 'So Ladies in Romance assist their Knight' [III. 129]. Although Pope immerses his poem in endless depths of literary allusion, his characters have little use for books; other forms of paper pass the time.

The Rape of the Lock was a runaway success. The new text filled up forty-eight pages - or three octavo sheets.

<sup>10</sup> See Tillotson's Appendix F in Twickenham II, 401-03, for various explanations of this curious line. For an engaging discussion of Belinda's reification, see C.E. Nicholson, 'A World of Artefacts: The Rape of the Lock as Social History', Literature and History (1979) V, ii, 183-93.

Along with eight pages of preliminary material, the frontispiece and five other engravings (all by Louis Du Guernier and Claude Du Bosc), the new Rape was at once a luxury item and, at a shilling, a good buy. No octavo edition of a poem before it had been treated so regally. Lintot, as Robert Halsband suggests, went to great lengths to adorn this medium-size octavo, presumably paying the engravers out of his own pocket; and 'it was evidently the first octavo book of English verse to be decorated with engraved headpieces, a tailpiece, and an ornamental initial letter, decorations that had previously been reserved mainly for stately folios.'<sup>11</sup> Halsband also uses David Foxon's English Verse 1701-1750: a catalogue of separately printed poems to establish the figures for the dearth of illustrated poems: 'from 1704 to 1724 (omitting the year 1714) out of almost two thousand separately published poems only twelve contained illustrative plates.'<sup>12</sup>

So why all the fuss over Pope's poem? Was it simply Lintot's appreciation of a sprightly masterpiece? Or did he think he was on to a bestseller which would tantalize the town if only he went to some extra pains over its production, its publicity and its distribution? Pope had already gone to some trouble to promote his Essay on Criticism,

<sup>11</sup> Robert Halsband, The Rape of the Lock and its illustrations 1714-1896 (Oxford, 1980), p. 4. Here he footnotes Foxon's typescript, Pope and the Early Eighteenth-Century Book-Trade (1976), f. 51, the basis for his Lyell lectures.

<sup>12</sup> Halsband proceeds to single out 1714 as an unusual year for book illustration; John Gay's Shepherd's Week had a frontispiece and six plates by Du Guernier (5).

hiding it from Tonson, taking it to W. Lewis, an obscure bookseller (and a Catholic) in Covent Garden, and when, after publication, sales seemed sluggish, taking matters into his own hands:

I heard that Pope. . . came every day, persecuting with anxious inquiries the cold impenetrable bookseller [Lewis], who, as the poem lay uncalled for, saw nothing but vexatious importunities in a troublesome youth. One day Pope, after nearly a month's publication, entered, and in despair tied up a number of the poems, which he addressed to several who had a reputation in town as judges of poetry. The scheme succeeded, and the poem, having reached its proper circle, soon got into request.<sup>13</sup>

Pope was demonstrably the sort of author booksellers would want to have. The better connected he became, the wider the sphere of influence; the more potential buyers he could buttonhole, the higher the profits. Pope's ambitions obviously fitted in with Lintot's.<sup>14</sup>

Pope explained the reason for the publication of the 1714 edition of the Rape of the Lock in his perhaps overly polite dedication to Mrs Fermor. Originally, it had been intended as a private amusement, 'But as it was

<sup>13</sup> Frank Arthur Mumby, Publishing and Bookselling, part I: From the earliest times to 1870 (London, 1930; rpt 1974), p. 138n. Mumby cites this anecdote from Isaac d'Israeli's Quarrels of Authors.

<sup>14</sup> Pope would have the fifth edition of his Essay on Criticism published by Lintot in 1716, for which he would be paid £15 for copyright on 17 July. See Foxon P813.

communicated with the Air of a Secret, it soon found its Way into the World. An imperfect Copy having been offer'd to a Bookseller, You had the Good-Nature for my Sake to consent to the Publication of one more correct'.<sup>15</sup> Mrs Fermor would surely not wish a corrupt edition to be read around town or in the country, whatever her views on the importance of textual correctness may have been. This reason for publishing would crop up again in a less attractive light when Pope outmanoeuvred Curll with his Letters. And more or less the same rationale would be applied - this time against Pope - when Bolingbroke published his Idea of a Patriot King in 1749. The deceit, if such it is, in offering the public a finely wrought edition of the Rape of the Lock can only be regarded as a playful one.

Yet, in spite of Pope's appeal to Arabella (which he subtly uses to ply his way into the hearts of his female readership at large), there could never have been any doubt that the poem would and should be published. And once in the bookshops, copies would not sit for long. Three thousand copies, so Pope wrote Caryll (~~whose 'Muse' is due~~), were sold in four days; and a reprint was ready, 'tho' not in so fair a manner as the first Impression'.<sup>16</sup> Still, at the same price and possibly with lower production costs,

<sup>15</sup> Twickenham II, 142.

<sup>16</sup> Correspondence of Alexander Pope, edited by George Sherburn, 5 volumes (Oxford, 1956), I, 214 (12 March 1714) [hereafter cited as Correspondence].

Lintot would probably not have objected. Sales figures soared to unprecedented heights on whatever chart Lintot may have kept on paper or inside his head.

A sense of inequity must have persisted. While Pope's poem generated record sales, he still only received the un princely sum of £22 (Lintot added a sweetener of £15 for the additions). A spin-off publication, the Key to the Lock, brought Pope, under the name of Esdras Barnivelt, a further £10 15s. No royalties with a percentage clause, no chance of a perquisite had Radio 3 then broadcast it. On the other hand, Pope was getting perhaps as much as a writer in his position could expect to get; or to put it another way, he was perhaps getting as much as his bookseller was willing to risk. Most original poems, then as now, did not sell at all well. One tends to overlook, in an aesthetically minded world, the fact that so many great poems shared a similar reception to that of Hume's Treatise of Human Nature which the author candidly admitted 'fell dead-born from the press, without reaching such distinction, as even to excite a murmur among the zealots'. Still, Pope's early verses had a better fate than Hume's first philosophical tract. From the outset of his remarkable career, Pope commanded a considerable readership, and this fact - based on a string of successful poems which won popular and critical accord over an encouraging number of years - gave him some clout with the trade.



We are fortunate in having ample records of Pope's early earnings as the first professional man of letters:

19 Feb 1712	Statius's Thebais/Vertumnus	£16. 2. 6
21 Mar	Rape of the Locke (1st ed.)	7.
9 Apr	Voiture/Silence/Successio	3.16. 6
23 Feb 1713	Windsor Forest	32. 5. 0
23 Jul	Ode on St. Cecilia's Day	15.
20 Feb 1714	Rape of the Lock (additions)	15.
23 Mar	Homer, vol I	215.
" "	650 Books on Royal Paper	176.
1 Feb 1715	Temple of Fame	32. 5. 0
31 Apr	Key to the Lock	10.15. 0
9 Feb 1716	Homer, vol. II	215.
7 May	650 Royal Paper	150.
17 Jul	Essay on Criticism (5th ed.)	15.
9 Aug 1717	Homer, vol. III	215.
6 Jan 1718	650 Royal Paper	150.
3 Mar	Homer, vol. IV	210.
" "	650 Royal Paper	150.
17 Oct	Homer, vol. V	210.
6 Apr 1719	650 Royal Paper	150.
26 Feb 1720	Homer, vol VI	210.
7 May	650 Royal Paper	150.
13 Dec 1721	Parnell's Poems	15.
—Paid Mr. Pope for the Subscription-money due on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> vol. Homer; & 5 <sup>th</sup>		840.
—Copy money for <u>Ody</u> I-III & 750 of each vol. printed on Royal Paper 4 <sup>to</sup>		615. 6. 0
—Copy money for <u>Ody</u> IV-V + 750 Royal		425.18. 7½
TOTAL		<u>£4244. 8. 7½</u>

This account of Lintot's payments to Pope, taken from John

Nichols' Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century (VIII. 299-300), plainly indicates how incommensurate eighteenth-century copyrights are with the way we tend to value the poems today. To take for example the first amount: Pope received over £16 for two poems we scarcely read today, The First Book of Statius's Thebais and Vertumnus and Pomona from Ovid; yet a month later he was paid £7 for the two-canto Rape of the Locke. From this, we might assume Lintot was more interested in translations than original poems. On the other hand, he paid out thirty guineas a year later for Windsor Forest; but again, the revised Rape fetched only half that amount for its three new cantos.

By this time Pope was assured of superlative sums for his Homer translations. In one sense the disparity between payments for the Iliad and his other works is illusory: the success of Pope's early works enabled him to secure such good terms for his Homer translations. It certainly would have been worth Pope's while to let Lintot have the 'Machinery' of the Rape for a comparatively paltry sum if it would help promote other projects. The give-and-take principle might work from either end. Lintot's advertisement at the back of the first edition of the Temple of Fame might be worth noting in this regard.

Lintot advertised the printing of the Temple of Fame in his usual way; the Monthly Catalogue carried a notice

in January 1715. He entered it in the Stationers' Register on 1 February and paid Pope thirty guineas for it on the same day. There are basically five parts to this octavo pamphlet: the half-title and title-page; Pope's brief advertisement; the text of the poem; Pope's notes on the text; and finally Lintot's advertisement. Pope's advertisement explains his adaptation of Chaucer and refers the reader to the third book of his House of Fame. Lintot's advertisement is, in fact, a petition to Queen Anne for a patent to his forthcoming edition of Chaucer. Is this a happy coincidence or has Lintot prodded Pope to apply his talents in this way at the same time as John Urry is consulting various sources at Christ Church, Oxford, for his forthcoming edition? It would make excellent sense, in the wake of the Rape of the Lock, for Lintot to promote his other projects in Pope's works. He may even have commissioned his most popular author and promised to double his copyright fee. The more copies of the Temple of Fame sold the more the public's appetite for Chaucer might be whetted, not only by Pope, but by his advertisement appended to Pope's poem. Between Pope and the promotional appeal for royal assent, there was little else Lintot could do to publicize his forthcoming Chaucer. Conversely, Lintot's enhanced payment for the Temple of Fame might have been a form of retrospective gratitude for the phenomenal sales of the Rape of the Lock.

That Pope amassed his fortune from his translations of Homer is common knowledge. Yet it would be erroneous to assume that the amount he received for the Iliad - 'five thousand three hundred and twenty pounds four shillings, without deduction' - came as a sudden windfall.<sup>17</sup> Sheer brilliance sparkling in endless original couplets would not have brought him the same sort of financial success as the more mundane activities as a writer: translating and editing. These side-lines (or at least we tend to regard them as such) could prove both financially rewarding and artistically, even personally dangerous. By translating Homer he might risk being damned with faint praise by Bentley; by counterattacking he might risk being horsewhipped by Bentley's son.<sup>18</sup> To edit Shakespeare was to tread on scholarly ground. It was part and parcel of the business of publishing.

The last dated payment on Nichols' list above - £15 for Parnell's Poems on 13 December 1721 - represents Pope's first professional entrance as an editor. When his close friend Thomas Parnell (who had helped Pope with his Homer) died in October 1718, Pope inherited his literary property '"almost with his dying Breath"'.<sup>19</sup> Poems on Several

<sup>17</sup> Samuel Johnson, Lives of the English Poets, edited by George Birkbeck Hill, 3 vols (Oxford, 1905), III, 118.

<sup>18</sup> Correspondence III, 446n.

<sup>19</sup> Twickenham VI, 240n.

Occasions (1722) may have been delayed by the dedicatory poem to the Earl of Oxford - Pope didn't get around to begging his Lordship's permission until 21 October 1721 - but the edition itself shows little in the way of intrusive apparatus. Pope's name appears on the title-page, but apart from the dedication his presence is undetectable: there are no prefatory remarks about Parnell, no recorded manuscript variations, no footnotes. It is what we might call a diplomatic edition in so far as we can rely on Pope's faithful reproduction of Parnell's text and Lintot's printer's accuracy. The minor slips which went unnoticed until the latter stages of production have been appended in a list of errata; there is also an index at the end of the volume. As with the Temple of Fame, Lintot advertised some of his other wares in Parnell's Poems: Pope's Homer is still available in six volumes royal quarto, folio and duodecimo; the works of Buckingham, Fenton, King and Dryden; and, in large and small paper folio 'with Cutts', the long-awaited Chaucer edition. Editing Chaucer, it seemed, was hazardous: Urry died in 1715, and when Thomas Ainsworth was finally chosen to complete the work he, in turn, died in 1719. The edition was finally revised by Timothy Thomas and published in 1721, but not before Lintot re-advertised Pope's Temple of Fame. Subscribers who had responded to the 1715 advertisement must have become impatient; many undoubtedly demanded their deposits back.

The Parnell edition was an uncomplicated affair - an 'occasional' selection of poems, a fitting tribute to the archdeacon who had died too young. Given his obsessive amending of poetical texts (and prose for that matter: vide the Patriot King), Pope may have touched up the odd phrase or tightened up a loose expression, reshuffled the whole canon or set some poems aside (Parnell's imitation of Donne's third satire wasn't published until Warburton's edition of 1751). But on the whole Pope's duties were hardly onerous. His work was more or less done for him by the author: 'What he gave me to publish, was but a small part of what he left behind him, but it was the best, and I will not make it worse by enlarging it.'<sup>20</sup> A friend editing the works of a dead poet does not want to be pedantic.

By this time Pope had become a one-man industry. His letter to the younger Jacob Tonson on 3 September [1721] from Oxford is bubbling with ideas. A Waller edition might be on the go; Kent must have a copper-plate on which to etch Addison's outline; Pope wants the scene divisions for the forthcoming Shakespeare edition done as quickly as possible so as not to hold up the index; he's decided to drop his name from Buckingham's Works; he wants Tonson to retrieve the book of sermons he lent Craggs the week before he died; and would he forward sixty pounds 'to ease me of part of

<sup>20</sup> Correspondence II, 24 (Pope to Jervas, 12 December 1718 [1720?]).



the drudgery of Shakespear'?<sup>21</sup> In the midst of all this swirling business, Pope still has the presence of mind to humour his recipient:

I know this will seem Romantic to a Bookseller, even to You that are least a Bookseller. But you must allow a little madness to Poets.

Pope's 'madness' might occasionally irk or annoy his booksellers, but his spirit of enterprise was admirable. And his efforts, if anything, produced results. As a writer of a form which is generally reckoned to have a small turn-over - I mean poetry - he was astonishingly prolific. As an editor of other writers' works he still generated texts, enhancing his already substantial output, yet, in terms of creative production, editing was a step or two down the ladder. As he wrote to Caryll:

I must again sincerely protest to you, that I have wholly given over scribbling, at least any thing of my own, but am become, by due gradation of dulness, from a poet a translator, and from a translator, a mere editor. Were I really capable at this time of producing any thing, I should be incapable of concealing it from you, who have been so many years one of my best critics, as well as one of my best friends.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Correspondence II, 80-81.

<sup>22</sup>Correspondence II, 140 (26 October [1722]).

Still, 'the dull duty of an Editor' could have its exciting moments.<sup>23</sup> In spite of what he said to Tonson in the above-mentioned letter, Pope decided to persevere with the edition of Buckingham's Works which, when it was published in two quarto volumes on 24 January 1723, was suppressed within a matter of days. The king was displeased with certain passages relating to the late revolution. Might Pope, as editor, hence by association, be regarded as a closet Jacobite? Depending on Pope's performance in the witness box at the Atterbury trial, how might his testimony (or the way in which it was interpreted by the press) affect his forthcoming Shakespeare edition? Would rumours of Pope's religious leanings have adverse effects on the subscription and sales?

R.H. Griffith sums up Pope's success in 1720:

May 12 was a red-letter day for Pope, for on that day were published the last two volumes of the Iliad. The completion of his task made Pope the first man in England who ever rendered himself financially independent through the sale of his published writings.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See the article by the same name by James R. Sutherland in Essential Articles, edited by Maynard Mack (Hamden, Conn., 1964), pp. 630-49; this has been reprinted from the Review of English Studies, vol. 21 (1945), 202-15. The chapter entitled 'A Mere Editor' in George Sherburn's Early Career of Alexander Pope (Oxford, 1934; rpt. 1968), pp. 218-47, leaves little room for further biographical exploration of Pope's editorial initiation. See also John A. Hart, 'Pope as a Scholar-Editor', Studies in Bibliography, XXII (1970), 45-59, for a re-evaluation of Pope's Shakespeare edition.

<sup>24</sup> See Griffith's Pope Bibliography, I i (1922)

Yet three years on, as Sherburn sums it up, all was not well:

All of these entanglements with Jacobitism and the consequent unfavourable publicity in the journals of the day made the first part of 1723 the least settled of any time in Pope's life since 1717. The situation illustrates the feverishness of the poet's existence. His mother was ill; he had Buckingham's suppressed Works to look after; he had Atterbury to defend; he had Shakespeare to edit, and he had two coadjutors to stimulate to industry and secrecy in the translation of the Odyssey. Work enough, certainly, for any invalid!<sup>25</sup>

The editor's lot was not any easy one. Perhaps it was even more complicated than that of the author. Original poetry was perhaps, as Pope's 1717 Preface suggests, more deserving of the reader's sympathy or suspended judgement - at least, 'a bad Author deserves better usage than a bad Critic'. An editor, on the other hand, was capitalizing on someone else's efforts, both literally and financially.<sup>26</sup> An editor could readily be accused of botching the job, of not basing his judgement on the proper authoritative text,

<sup>25</sup> Sherburn, Early Career, p. 230.

<sup>26</sup> See Gentleman's Magazine, LVII i (January, 1787), 76, for a list of editorial earnings throughout the century. For Shakespeare, Rowe was paid £36 10s.; Pope £217 12s. (with £30 14s. for Fenton—who later received part of the £60 Pope asked Tonson to send to Oxford—and £35 17s. 6d. for Gay); Theobald received £652 10s. for his 1733 edition (eight years after Pope's); and Warburton got £500 for his ill-fated 1747 'collaborative' edition. Dr Johnson received £375 for his first edition and a further £100 for the second edition. All told, Shakespeare's editors made a total of £2,228 10s 6d.

of lumbering his pages with unnecessary annotation or of not saying enough. Critical reaction from a less successful competitor - Theobald (Pope's exact contemporary: 1688-1744) also penned plays, poems, essays, translations and even a 'Life' of Buckingham intended to preface Curll's edition of the Works - could be more sneering than the following which concerns a passage from the Comedy of Errors:

In this miserably mangled Condition is this Passage exhibited in the first Folio. All the Editions since have left out the last Couplet of it; I presume, as too hard for them. Mr. Pope, who pretends to have collated the first Folio, should have spar'd us the Lines, at least, in their Corruption. —I communicated my Doubts upon this Passage to my Friend Mr. Warburton; and to his sagacity I owe, in good part, the Correction of it.<sup>27</sup>

Apart from either being chastened by this disclosure or angered by its triviality - the line between true criticism and sarcasm sometimes being blurred - Pope may have registered something else. This may have been the first occasion Pope came across the name Warburton. Any notion of partisan editorial relationships should first be stamped with a date. Would Pope remember this note a decade later when he decided to name Warburton as his literary executor?

Literary 'estates' have always been and continue to be

<sup>27</sup> Shakespeare, Works, edited by Lewis Theobald, 7 vols (London, 1733), III, 15n. [Comedy of Errors, II i (no line numbers).]

riddled by complex personal issues: witness the on-going debates in the Times Literary Supplement and the Observer concerning Eliot's and Auden's literary effects. This thesis concerns itself more with posthumous Pope than Pope living. When a poet dies, he becomes, as it were, objectified in his editions. No more can he tamper with the sums of his experience: he is left to the calculations of his editor. Pope was the first writer to take an active interest in the way his works were presented. For the purposes of arranging his 'complete' Works and ushering them through the press after his death, he enlisted the aid of William Warburton. Pope's choice of editors has baffled critics over the past century; yet in many ways Warburton was the exact sort of candidate Pope wanted. With a mixture of subtlety and eagerness, he groomed Warburton for a job which would substantially alter his own career and make the poet's immortality a somewhat troublesome proposition.

Pope, of course, acted as his own editor from as early as 1716. Even his Preface, dated 10 November, underwent a series of revisions before it was printed for the 1717 Works.<sup>28</sup> His self-effacing evocation of the poet's teetering between doubt and assurance is, in the aftermath of the popularity of the Rape of the Lock, is a trifle overindulgent;

<sup>28</sup> See Maynard Mack's 'Pope's 1717 Preface with a Transcription of the Manuscript Text' in Collected in Himself: essays critical, biographical, and bibliographical on Pope and some of his contemporaries (Newark, Delaware, 1982), pp. 159-78.

but in terms of criticism and common sense, Pope's 1717 Preface is an eloquent document worthy of any editor's admiration. Annotations are used sparingly, sometimes adding to the mock-ironic relish of a line like, '(But airy substance soon unites again)': an asterisk refers us to 'Milton, lib. 6 of Satan cut asunder by the Angel Michael.' But the 'wretched Sylph's' pre-Disney miracle needs no allusion to make it more vivid. Tillotson adds a further reference to canto III, 152; but Pope is surely tormenting his reader - deliciously - at the moment of consummation.

Pope's introduction to his 1735 Works is laconic - a somewhat dry inventory which refers the reader to the 1717 Preface. Dated 1 January 1734, this 'Author to the Reader' sounds much like the sort of thing the vexed poet of Arbuthnot would send off to the printer. When he asks, 'Why did I write?', he might have pursued this line of self-analysis by delving into editing. There is no verb 'to edit' in Dr Johnson's Diction-ary, although 'he that revises or prepares any work for publication' is illustrated by 'This nonsense got into all the editions by a mistake of the stage editors' from Pope's Shakespeare.

Annotations are again scarce in the 1735 Works, that is, up until the Dunciad. Fittingly enough, the attacks on Pope's more pedantic efforts inspired his greatest scholarly satire. Yet the Dunciad offered a reason for Pope's editing Shakespeare: it needed doing. The public wanted an edition. Besides, no man but a blockhead ever edited, except for money.



### Between Editor and Bookseller

The preface to Moral and Political Dialogues provides as vivid an illustration as any of the various transactions which were conducted between an editor and a bookseller shortly after Warburton published his Pope edition.<sup>1</sup> The two principals in this exchange are fictionalized voices of the main inheritors of the Pope-Warburton-Knapton nexus. The role of the young aspiring editor is played by Richard Hurd while that of the more pragmatic bookseller is portrayed by Andrew Millar.

By the time these anonymously edited Dialogues were published in 1759, the Knapton name had been replaced by that of Millar in Pope imprints; and Hurd had become a frequent guest at Prior Park where he may have contemplated following Warburton in the way that Warburton had followed Pope.<sup>2</sup> Hurd, in fact, sent a manuscript copy of his Dialogues to Warburton for his learned advice, and the older editor replied, 'A book of such dialogues must be very taking: therefore don't engage yourself with a bookseller till we weigh the matter well.'<sup>3</sup> The preface

<sup>1</sup> [Richard Hurd] Moral and Political Dialogues, London, Printed for A. Millar, in the Strand; and W. Thurlborne and J. Woodyer at Cambridge, 1759.

<sup>2</sup> Hurd eventually <sup>acquired</sup> ~~inherited~~ the books bequeathed by Pope to Warburton and Allen and was one of Warburton's executors.

<sup>3</sup> Letters from a late Eminent Prelate, edited by Richard Hurd (Kidderminster, 1808), pp. 146-47 (15 November 1755).

was presumably written after Warburton had returned the manuscript and recommended his own bookseller, Millar. Given the parodic nature of the preface in relation to the dialogues which follow, it may well have been inspired by Millar as a novel way of presenting hum-drum material. Dialogues between Digby, Arbuthnot and Addison on the 'Golden Age of Elizabeth' might not lend themselves to massive sales, but if the first few pages provoked some laughter in the shop perhaps the book would attract more attention than most.<sup>4</sup>

The preface begins by giving the reader an impression of its own genesis: the editor, full of enthusiasm and naive expectations, goes full-tilt to a shop where he thinks his every dream will be realized, where the man behind the counter will be waiting with bated breath to transform the manuscript ink into fine-paper print:

As soon as my good fortune had thrown the following curious dialogues into my hands, I determined forthwith to give them in full measure, and in the best manner, to the deserving public. With this view, having enriched them with a course of notes critical and explanatory, I sent them to a bookseller of good credit and acquainted him in a civil way, that though I demanded for myself but a moderate share of the profits, I should consent to a pretty large impression. I even intimated to him that I should not be displeased, if he took to himself the benefit of running off

<sup>4</sup>Hurd's Moral and Political Dialogues evidently sold fairly well. Millar published a second edition in the following year (1760), and the sixth edition, in a three-volume set, came out in 1788.

two thousand copies.<sup>5</sup>

We can imagine the knowing grin widening on the bookseller's face as the editor walks out the door with the confident step of a man who has just entered the exalted profession of letters. They have agreed to meet a few days hence to discuss terms.

When the young man returns to the shop in hope of a quick transaction, the bookseller quickly confronts him with the realities of the market-place. 'Two thousand copies!' the bookseller exclaims as he proceeds almost literally to decimate the editor's hopes. 'I tell you honestly, Sir, I dare venture on no more than Two hundred and fifty.' The editor stammers his protests, flaccidly commending the high quality of the dialogues between 'men, once fairly existing in the world, nay and the most respectable of their times, the very same, many of them, whose works you sell so well and so creditably live by'(ii). True, the bookseller admits, but few people these days are interested in 'posthumous works'. He would have preferred something a little more lively - 'some love-adventure or court-intrigue', preferably 'scandalous'.

They have been dreaming at cross-purposes. While the editor fondly imagines his Dialogues will be the talk of

<sup>5</sup>Moral and Political Dialogues, i. Further references are given in parentheses after quotations in the text.

the town within ten days of publication, the bookseller wishes he had a runaway success like Pompey the little (the story of a lap-dog) or a steadily popular Meditation on the starry heavens on his hands. They commence haggling over the numbers of the first edition. The bookseller adamantly refuses to go over two hundred and fifty copies, giving a rough but reasonable estimation of sales:

Thus far I go on sure grounds. Sir, I have made my calculation. Taking in the several pamphlet-clubs and circulating libraries about town, and the learned assemblies of reading divines in the country, and allowing for some dozen or two of your own friends and chance-customers, that number [250 copies], I verily believe, may be got off. (vi-vii)

Against the bookseller's experience of the market, the editor's hopes stand little chance. He must either sharpen his salesmanlike skills or reconcile himself to a small impression which is not likely to immortalize his efforts.

Putting aside their quibbling over numbers for the time being, the editor and bookseller proceed to discuss the finer points of the intended publication. What size and quality of paper should the Dialogues be printed on, how wide should the margins be, should special ornaments be cut for the first edition? The editor thinks no expense should be spared: the book should be as lavishly produced

as possible in honour of its illustrious speakers - Cowley, Sprat and Waller to name but a few. A thick sumptuous quarto, fit for a scholar's book-shelf, judiciously adorned with rococo ornaments, would be appropriate. 'All that, in due time', advises the bookseller:

When a book has made its fortune with the lower class, these decorations may do well, and help to bring it into better company. But there is no hazarding this expence at first. Your plain English reader loves his pennyworth for his penny. He is apt to startle at a thin page and large margin, and thinks your pictures but a pretty device to cheat him of his money.—Sir, allow me to be the best judge of these matters. (x-xi)

So there are to be no embellishments, no engravings, no trace of spacious lines or margins as in Pope's 1735 Works.

But the bookseller offers one suggestion which might eventually help the editor to achieve his dream of the deluxe edition: 'there is one thing you will do well to consider. You intend to dedicate—' The editor has already considered the possibility and dismissed it: 'I cannot bring myself to beg the patronage of any of them to these dialogues. It would look like a distrust of their own merit.' About the same time as this preface to Moral and Political Dialogues was conceived, the custom

of dedication sustained a serious blow from Samuel Johnson's famous letter to Lord Chesterfield which begged the ironically defining question, 'Is not a Patron, my Lord, one who looks with unconcern on a man struggling for life in the water, and, when he has reached the ground, encumbers him with help?'<sup>6</sup> Pride of independence imbues the editor's labours. However, the bookseller still regards a dedication as a good promotional gimmick:

. . . a dedication, as I take it, is for our sake, not their's [sic; i.e. the patron's]. A noble name in front of a new work does the office of a fair sign. It catches the eye of passengers, and invites custom. And it is purely, Sir, upon this footing that I make bold to recommend it. (xii)

But the editor will have none of it: his book will stand or fall on its own without the false prop of patronage. Otherwise, his approach to his own book has been fairly modest. He has adopted the self-effacing role of the scholar behind the text, imposing his editorial presence only occasionally upon the reader: 'of the Notes, indeed, I say nothing, because they are my own proper manufacture. But good judges

<sup>6</sup>Quoted from The Oxford Book of Literary Anecdotes, edited by James Sutherland (Oxford, 1975), p. 84. Dr Johnson's letter is dated 7 February 1755.



tell me they cannot be ill received in so note-writing an age as the present, when Hudibras or Horace equally serves the turn for a commentator to shew his wit on'.

Once the editor agrees to compromise his ideals of large type, good paper, and prestigious designs (which would have given 'the public to understand they have to do with no vulgar writer'), he renews his desire for a larger impression. In a suspicious whim of generosity, the bookseller agrees to double the figure to five hundred copies - and here's the catch - 'provided the additional two hundred and fifty be ushered in with a new title-page, setting forth the SECOND EDITION' (x). The otherwise honourable editor readily submits to this somewhat shady proposition. This is one of the dubious practices of the trade which Warburton criticized in his 1748 Letter from an Author to a Member of Parliament concerning Literary Property.<sup>7</sup> As Warburton's protégé, Hurd intends the second-edition gambit to be interpreted as a satirical inversion; but the episode subtly demonstrates how a bookseller might manipulate an author or editor in consenting to a subterfuge which might eventually prove to be disadvantageous. Buyers of the first edition who later see copies of the 'improved' second edition will feel cheated (more than likely by the author

<sup>7</sup>In Warburton's Works, 7 vols (London, 1788), [edited by Richard Hurd], VII, 926-27. Warburton's views on literary property will be taken up in my last chapter in the section on Andrew Millar.

or editor, rather than the bookseller); and if the writer is paid on the basis of sales on the first edition alone, the bookseller might rush ahead with the second, supposedly better edition, thereby increasing his profits and at the same time discouraging sales of the original. Of course, if the writer promised greater selling books in the future, the bookseller might be more willing to share the profits.

Still, the editor gradually reveals his awareness of some of the stratagems of the trade. When the bookseller questions him as to whether the Dialogues might, instead of the 'furniture of a noble peer's mind', be 'the sweepings of a dirty garret' (i.e. a fake), they share an in-joke of the trade. The bookseller asks about the origin of the Dialogues because one of his lodgers, a Scots gentleman, 'has some slight suspicions of that nature', to which the editor retorts, 'Oh, none like your Scots critic for smelling out a roguery.' With memories of William Lauder's Miltonic fraud<sup>8</sup> still fresh,

<sup>8</sup>Pope may have had something to do with precipitating the 'Lauder affair' which erupted gradually from 1747 to 1750 in the Gentleman's Magazine. William Lauder (c. 1680-1771) sent Pope a copy of his edition of Arthur Johnston's Latin poetry hoping for some support in a dispute over poetic merit. Pope's delayed reply took the form of a couplet in the 1742 Dunciad which enraged Lauder: 'On two unequal crutches propt he came, / Milton's on this, on that one Johnston's name' (Twick. V, p. 352, ll. 111-12). Lauder (who lost a leg after being hit in the knee with a golf-ball on Bruntsfield Links) blamed Pope for the loss of £20-30 per annum when sales of his Johnston edition dropped. The bitter Edinburgh scholar subsequently plotted his revenge on Milton. See DNB and James L. Clifford, Dictionary Johnson (London, 1979), pp. 57-70 for accounts of this bizarre controversy.

the bookseller gives the appearance of wanting to avoid any publishing 'imposture'. The editor will furnish proof, but what difference will it make if his Dialogues are bona fide or not?

For where is the hurt, I mean to the bookseller, if some learned critic steps forth and undertakes to prove the whole collection to be spurious? This, of course, brings on a controversy. The public attention is raised. Pamphlets are published on both sides. And when matters become embroiled, or the subject grows stale, out comes an advertisement that the original manuscripts are in your hands, for the satisfaction of the curious. All this while you are on the winning side. And the contention only serves to quicken the sale and confirm the credit of the collection. (ix)

It almost sounds as if the editor has been a bookseller before. He certainly knows the financial benefits to be gained from a long, drawn-out pamphlet war. A scholar's reputation was one thing; a brisk turn-over another. Lauder's 'proof' of Milton's plagiarism may have put a temporary dent in the state of English letters, but the London book trade would have relished the number of spin-off publications.

The self-satirizing candour of this episode is, in itself, a gimmick. By the end of the preface, the bookseller and editor have come to terms, and the editor goes off to write a - in fact, this - preface. The browser in

the shop might be charmed by this behind-the-scenes or in-the-making exchange and wonder if the man he is about to buy the book from is the gentleman referred to on page viii. Here is a book that is comically aware of its own manufacture. The preface shares some of that pleasant self-consciousness which percolates through Tom Jones, but unlike Fielding's narrator (who instantly and confidently creates a bond with his reader), Hurd's editor gains the bookseller's attention, and the reader is only brought in indirectly. The preface to Moral and Political Dialogues is perhaps closer in its teasing spirit to the more monological narrative begun in the same year, Tristram Shandy.

Warburton, we can readily assume, was in a much more advantageous position than the editor trying to flog his Dialogues, but the concern over the physical presentation of Pope's Works would not have been altogether different. As the executor of the most prosperous literary estate of its time, Warburton could hand-pick his bookseller. Still, the main factor in the bookseller's decision to take up the offer of publishing a set of Pope's Works would be the total sum of profits he would earn at the end of the job. Few booksellers at that time, for example, would have risked publishing a set of Pope's Works in folio, complete with the same sort of heavy ornamentation as the 1735 Works. Simply put, no practical bookseller was

likely to publish any author's works (to quote Robert Foulis) 'without hopes of being indemnified by the first edition'.<sup>9</sup>

Hurd's preface gives us a rare glimpse into the dealings between editor and bookseller which are subtly different from those between author and bookseller. To a certain extent an editor was less personally - and more professionally - attached to the works he or she was trying to sell. Ironically enough for Pope, it was his secondary functions as a writer - as a translator of Homer and an editor of Shakespeare - for which he was most financially rewarded. Original compositions still paid little in spite of sometimes overwhelming success. Along with Pope's account of the sales of The Rape of the

Creators of poems and their editors might be lumped under the same general heading as producers,<sup>10</sup> but when it comes to what either of them was paid, independently or in relation to each other, we still know very little:

The rise of the professional author is perhaps the most neglected topic in the history of the book trade; the author, the fountainhead of the trade, has been ignored by historians both of publishing and, in his capacity as paid worker, of literature.<sup>11</sup>

Pope's poems made little compared to his Shakespeare (£217 12s.)

<sup>9</sup> Egerton 1959.f.20 (20 December 1754); see Appendix A.

<sup>10</sup> Pat Rogers, 'Books, Readers and Patrons', p. 214.

<sup>11</sup> John Feather, 'John Nourse and his Authors', Studies in Bibliography, XXIV (1981), 205-26; p. 205.

and the estimated £11,000 for the Iliad and Odyssey translations.<sup>12</sup> Undoubtedly, it was on the basis of his reputation as an original writer that Pope was able to secure such good terms from his booksellers for his translations and editing jobs; yet when we label Pope as the first professional writer, we ought to add that the bulk of his fortune came not from original creation but from his labours on the works of other writers. And, of course, it is one of the ironies of literary history that we scarcely dip into his Homer or his Shakespeare, yet we are introduced to his original poems at an age, generally speaking, when we are neither properly equipped to appreciate his craft (youth being prone to avoid the regimentation of rhyming couplets) nor sufficiently dipped in the eighteenth-century milieu.

The eighteenth-century bookseller has often been depicted as the bane of writers - the pouncing capitalist ready to extract pounds from some young, naive writer's manuscript. There were no doubt rapacious entrepreneurs who benefitted by the unspoken intimations of a gentlemanly arrangement. Yet the most successful booksellers of their time - the Millars and the Strahans - made their fortunes not through deceitful stratagems but through a simple and straightforward insight into the laws of supply and demand. They saw the

<sup>12</sup> For a comprehensive perspective on writers' earnings, see Pat Rogers, 'Introduction: the writer and society', in The Context of English Literature: The Eighteenth Century, edited by Pat Rogers (London, 1978), pp. 1-80, pp. 52-56.



relationship between authors, editors and booksellers as a symbiotic one; without mutual co-operation a continuing industry was likely to flounder. A quick coup in which the bookseller grabbed all the stakes might succeed in the short term, but if the bookseller acquired an avaricious reputation, he might find himself hard-pressed for original copy in the long term. To booksellers like Millar and Strahan it made good business sense to reward their writers (who, after all, gave them their livelihoods) and to cultivate a sound, respectable image.

Hurd's preface leaves us with an impression of co-operation (and, to a slight extent, collusion) between editor and bookseller. The editor has a manuscript he thinks other people will want to read; and the bookseller has a product he thinks he can sell. It is a matter of trust and common sense. The experienced bookseller need not take advantage of the editor's apparent ingenuousness. Both can meet their desired ends if they are reasonably honest with each other. The only slight deception - that of the 'second edition' - will only marginally affect the reader; it may even be economically advantageous in the long-run by cutting down printing costs (forms would not have to be reset for the 'second edition'). Such a practice might not even be uncovered until a modern bibliographer collated the two editions. The stereotyped bookseller still remains subject to common sense and economics of his time.

### Book Openings

Hurd's preface gives us, in line with its penetrating insights into its preface-maker, a sense of the editor's pre-occupation with the physical appearance of his book-to-be. The fine paper, the large print, the wide margins, the 'pictures' and ornaments were in a large part ideals of an age gone by in book production. The editor no longer exerted control over how his pages would appear to the reader; or rather, he had to shed his illusions about reproducing the sumptuous models of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Fewer folio and quarto editions and more octavo and duodecimo editions were being published by the 1750s if for no other reason than the fact that the make-up of the buying market had changed considerably. The demographic configurations, the growth of literacy amongst the lower classes, the need for books by an expanding, mercantile market, the introduction of circulating libraries, all took their toll on the more lavishly produced book.

It may be worth our while to make a brief comparison between editions which Pope oversaw and posthumous editions of his Works edited by Warburton in order to form at least a vague impression of how Pope conceptualized his Works and what kind of posthumous collection he might have wanted. To attempt to do so, I propose we consider the changes between the 'openings' of the 1717, 1735 and 1751 Works.

### Five Title-pages

The title-pages which precede this introduction should ideally be looked at in quincunx. They have been included for the purpose of giving an overall impression of the presentation of Pope's Works over a half-century span. As David Foxon advises, 'in these days of xerography any bibliographer who doesn't carry copies of his title-pages with him is wasting time'.<sup>1</sup> The first four examples have been catalogued by Griffith, so there is little bibliographically that need be explained; and the last example has been taken from a not particularly significant edition. Rather, I would like to look at them briefly in their relation to the book trade.

Taken altogether, the five title-pages offer a fair range of formats, from the folio edition of 1717 to the duodecimo of 1770. To a certain extent, different formats were intended for different levels of the market. Size is obviously related to the price paid for each edition; and the numbers of each impression printed up would give us a reasonable idea of how much the bookseller thought he could sell (or distribute), and a comparison of figures for, say, a folio and a duodecimo would be a fairly reliable indicator of how many copies the bookseller anti-

<sup>1</sup>David F. Foxon, Thoughts on the History and Future of Bibliographical Description (Los Angeles, 1970), p. 20.

cipated selling to higher and lower ends of the market. Title-pages seem to have been designed accordingly to their expected purchasers.

The buyer of the 1717 folio, to take our first example, would have been struck by the fold-out mini-poster of Pope engraved by George Vertue after the painting by Charles Jervas.<sup>2</sup> The title-page opposite offers a pleasing contrast of straight borders and wild ornamentation, promising the rococo decadence of the Rape of the Lock within the tight confines of rhyming couplets; a mixture of the sensuous and the disciplined. Beneath the formality of title and motto lurks an earthly image. Yet for all the dazzle of the first glimpse, the 1717 Works turns out to be a fairly conservative production in terms of embellishment: there is not a single ornament elsewhere in the edition.<sup>3</sup> The three sections of the title-page, divided by rules into title/motto/ornament and imprint, are thus judiciously balanced with the Latin inscription as a sort of fulcrum. The imprint completes the tripartite relationship of author, printer and bookseller. Unusual for this time, the printer's name is proudly proclaimed. The overall image of the edition is orderly, classical, scholarly,

<sup>2</sup>For more information about the 1717 frontispiece, see W.K. Wimsatt's The Portraits of Alexander Pope (New Haven and London, 1965), pp. 17-19 (hereafter cited as Wimsatt). The photocopy preceding this chapter has been reduced.

<sup>3</sup>The titlepage ornament to the 1717 Works has been catalogued in K.I.D. Maslen's The Bowyer Ornament Stock, Oxford Bibliographical Society occasional publications no. 8 (1973), p. 29, as ornament number 127.

with just a hint of glitter.

The title-page to the 1735 quarto edition of Pope's Works would not appear very different in style from its 1717 folio precursor: the same title, the same motto, and in the place of the two cherub faces under the floral basket and two butterflies is the line engraving by Peter Fourdrinier after the design by William Kent of two putti embracing over a medallion of Pope.<sup>4</sup> The dual line borders have been removed, and the names of William Bowyer and Bernard Lintot have been replaced by those of Pope's new printer and bookseller, respectively, John Wright and Lawton Gilliver. There is no frontispiece to the 1735 Works, but in contrast to the absence of ornamentation in the 1717 folio (apart from its title-page), the later volume shows a superfluity of artistic embellishment throughout. The second volume of Pope's Works has, if anything, a more sumptuous feel than the first; more wide and even than long and narrow. Typographically, the italics of Pope's name have lost their long serifs of 1717, and the 'W' in 'WORKS' is no longer two interlocking 'V's'. Also, the words 'Works', 'Volume II.', and 'London:' appear in red ink. (The 1717 title-page is all in black.) Apart from these minor differences, the 1735 Works make a fitting companion to the earlier collection. Pope possibly intended

<sup>4</sup>Wimsatt, pp. 125-27.

the two title-pages to be as uniform as their eighteen-year difference would allow, at least within the prevailing tastes of the mid 1730s. The repeated motto permits more than a modicum of continuity.

Turning back to the 1720 Miscellaneous Poems and Translations, we notice that even though this edition (the third of its kind) does not announce itself as a collection of Works, it contains all of the main poems of the 1717 folio. The title-page, in fact, doubles as a contents page, offering the Essay on Criticism, Rape of the Lock, Eloisa to Abelard, and various others, one of which is the first publication of Pope's epitaph to Rowe. This edition, 'By several Hands', reflects an inherent degree of what we might call market research: it is an edition which presents most of the 1717 contents, but with the expendable pieces (for example, the dedicatory poems and Pope's preface) trimmed off. Judging by its ornaments, this edition was printed by William Bowyer, although, unlike the 1717 folio, his name does not appear in the imprint.

The frontispiece to this 1720 duodecimo Miscellaneous Poems depicts a more down-market Pope in undone coat and baggy cap. He looks rather blandly to one side with no hair apparent, his ear jutting out awkwardly; this Pope is quite unlike the earlier version which looks defiantly at the beholder, with flowing tresses and a hand in pincer-like writer's cramp. The 1720 image has again been engraved



by Vertue (although, on this occasion, after the 1716 portrait by Sir Godfrey Kneller)<sup>5</sup> although it is a much plainer presentation; no serrated frame, overhead bow or scrolled pedestal. This edition would have appealed to a much broader market than the 1717 Works and presumably outsold the more expensive edition several times over. Lintot, perhaps with Pope's accord, is recycling the Works under a different title in order to lure a wider readership with a much more casual, less formally presented product - a miscellany.

Leaping ahead to the first posthumous edition of 1751, the prospective buyer is confronted with a collaborative project. Pope's Works are now 'complete'. The definitive nature of this edition is underlined by the fact that it contains his final 'Corrections, Additions, and Improvements'. What is more, his Works have been supplemented by the 'Commentary and Notes of Mr. Warburton'. This promises to be the last word on Pope. The binary nature of this edition is mirrored in its title-page which shows Pope and Warburton being linked together by angelic cherubs in the company of even more angelic muses of writing and music.<sup>6</sup> These Works are obviously bulkier than their predecessors, although Pope was aiming towards a

<sup>5</sup>Wimsatt, pp. 35-37.

<sup>6</sup>The 1751 frontispiece is discussed at greater length in chapter IV below.

nine-volume octavo edition in the last five years of his life. Given the greater cost of producing the 1751 edition, a group of booksellers rather than one individual appear in the imprint. The uncited printer is the son of the printer of Pope's 1717 Works, William Bowyer II. The title-page tends more towards the verbally crowded 1720 title-page than the more spacious ones of 1717 and 1735. It packs information rather than conveys impressions of sumptuousness. But the facts given on Warburton's title-page are of a different order to the table of contents on the 1720 Miscellaneous Poems: Warburton seems at once anxious to establish his credentials and defiant of any one who dares to criticize his position. This is a title-page which strives for economy, yet stumbles over its self-justification.

Finally, the 1770 duodecimo edition in six volumes repeats most of the information given in the 1751 title-page. The passage of time is reflected in its imprint; fifteen individual booksellers now own a share of Pope's Works which have become a run-of-the-mill trade edition. The frontispiece has been re-engraved in a grotesque fashion, and ornaments seem to have faded from use, leaving the printer's identity a mystery. Still, its lack of frills might recommend it to students and others who preferred not to spend a lot on an octavo edition. By 1770, the full range of potential Pope buyers was well served.

A.F. Johnson touches briefly on our period in his article, 'Title-pages: their forms and development', with the concluding generalization, 'With the eighteenth century title-pages became simpler and letters became lighter'.<sup>7</sup> William Caslon, who was encouraged by Bowyer to set up his own type foundry, set the standard for English typography, to be followed by Baskerville whose printing exceeded continental innovations. Johnson also notes the influence of P.S. Fournier on title-page lay-out and the use of decorative capitals. It would be interesting to know which book design (if any one in particular) impressed Pope when he was planning his 1717 Works; the correspondence cannot help us in this regard. Nor do we know to what extent an author could dictate the presentation of his works at this time. More than likely, the details of book design were decided between the bookseller and his printer.

From his earliest days as a professional writer, Pope took an active interest in the promotion and distribution of his works, as Isaac d'Israeli's above-cited anecdote (on page 11) suggests. It should be added that he also took great care over advertisements, even to the extent of sending a draft of the lay-out to the publisher-printer Samuel Buckley:

<sup>7</sup>This article (mainly on earlier title-pages) appears in Selected Essays on Books and Printing, edited by Percy H. Muir (Amsterdam, 1970), pp. 288-97; p. 297.

I shall take it as a favour of you to insert the inclosed advertisement both in the Gazette & Daily Courant, three times. What I particularly recommend to your care is to cause it to be distinguished with proper dignity, & the title in Capitals, as here drawn. Also to stand at the head of the more vulgar advertisements at least rankd before Eloped wives, if not before Lost Spaniels & Strayd Geldings.<sup>8</sup>

By the time of the 1735 Works Pope showed himself to be well-versed in the smooth numbers of salesmanship:

It was meerly an Unwillingness to give you Trouble, thathinderd my doing myself the Service of desiring your Assistance in printing this book. As it is, it has cost me dear, & may dearer, if I am to depend on my Bookseller [Gilliver] for the Reimbursement. If it lye in your way to help me off with 150 of them, (which are not to be sold to the Trade at less than 18s or to Gentlemen than a Guinea) it would be a Service to me, a Bookseller having had the Conscience to offer me 13s a piece, & being modestly content to get 8s in the pound himself, after I have done him many services. Another, quite a Stranger, has taken 100 at 17s but I want to part with the rest.<sup>9</sup>

Pope has by this time become his own manager, having set up his own bookseller, Lawton Gilliver, and printer, John Wright.<sup>10</sup> In other words, he has eliminated the middleman in order to increase his profits.

<sup>8</sup>Correspondence, II, 285 (Pope to Samuel Buckley [20 January 1724/5]). Cited by James A. Winn, 'On Pope, Printers and Publishers', Eighteenth Century Life, VI (1981), 93.

<sup>9</sup>Correspondence, III, 454 (Pope to Buckley, 9 April 1735).

<sup>10</sup>See J. McLaverty, 'A Study of John Wright and Lawton Gilliver: Alexander Pope's Printer and Bookseller' (unpublished B. Litt. dissertation, Pembroke College, Oxford, 1974).

### A Matter of Mottos

In closing this introductory survey of Pope title-pages, I would like to point out one slight but perhaps significant change between the contemporary works and the posthumous edition. Both the 1717 and 1735 Works carry a motto - in fact, the same motto - from Cicero. Translated this reads:

These studies are an impetus to youth,  
and a delight to age; they are an adornment  
to good fortune, refuge and relief in  
trouble; they enrich private and do not  
hamper public life; they are with us by  
night, they are with us on long journeys,  
they are with us in the depths of the  
country.<sup>1</sup>

This motto obviously meant something to Pope; otherwise he would not have included it in two editions some eighteen years apart.

No motto appears on the 1751 title-page; there was no room for one. However, Warburton chose a motto, again from Cicero, which was printed on the verso of the title-page. In English, it goes:

[Therefore,] if you will only look on high  
[and contemplate this eternal home and resting

<sup>1</sup>This translation of Cicero's Pro Archia, VII, xvi, has been taken from The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, 2nd edition (Oxford, 1953), p. 145 (item 16).

place,] you will no longer attend to the gossip of the vulgar herd or put your trust in human rewards for your exploits. Virtue herself, by her own charms, should lead you on to true glory. Let what others say of you be their own concern; whatever it is, they will say it in any case.<sup>2</sup>

This advice from Cicero is ironically à propos once we look into the attacks on Warburton's editorial reputation and his sometimes inappropriate replies to his self-appointed Dunces in the footnotes to the 1751 Pope edition. If anyone kept up with 'the gossip of the vulgar herd', Warburton did; and his vituperative annotations seem completely removed from any aloof perspective of virtue. He could sling mud with the best (and worst) of his critics, but as we shall see in my third chapter, Warburton was vastly outnumbered by his detractors. As the risk of contradicting what I've just said, Warburton's own acidic responses are comparatively mild. To take one example, Warburton's passing sneer at Theophilus Cibber in the Arbuthnot footnotes (ver. 169) started a chain reaction which culminated in Cibber's hundred-page eruption, A Familiar Epistle. Whenever (to re-mix metaphors) Warburton's tea-pot poured, onlookers prepared for a tempest.

In many ways, Warburton was the author (and, more to the

<sup>2</sup>This translation is taken from the Loeb edition of Cicero's De Re Publica, trans. Clinton W. Keyes (London, 1977), vol. XVI, p. 279 (Republic, VI, xxiii). Phrases omitted from the 1751 motto are in square brackets.



point, the editor) of his own misfortune. The change of mottos is, I think, symptomatic of the contradictory condition and the critical malaise in which Warburton produced the Pope edition. Pope's motto is exactly what it should be: words wholly appropriate to his function as a writer; words which have helped to define his position as an artist; words which poignantly and nobly express his debt to the past and his desire to continue within his own present tradition.

Warburton's change of mottos begs the unanswerable question (which will dog much of what is to follow): would this have met with Pope's approval? It is a simple bone of contention, yet one which defies resolution. On one hand, Pope gave Warburton considerable lee-way in adding commentary to his verses; on the other hand, Pope may not have foreseen such a minor change. We are faced with the crux of an author's assumed intentions and an editor's execution of his trust. There are, I think, a number of changes in the Warburton edition which Pope (given the benefit of a posthumous blue-pencil) would have objected to in the strongest of terms or, if he wanted Warburton to continue with the job, with the most subtle diplomacy.

The first thing Pope might have started at was the frontispiece which emphasized the editor at the poet's expence. More than one of Warburton's critics pointed out this pictorial form of usurpation, as we shall see in

my fourth chapter. The next thing I imagine Pope feeling uncomfortable about is the motto - it is very much the editor's motto, one which makes a substantially different impression upon the reader than the one which graced the title-pages to the 1717 and 1735 Works. Warburton's motto raises uncomfortable questions in the reader's mind: is the reader meant to be counted as part of the 'vulgar herd'? is the editor placing himself on a superior plane? and what does he mean by 'Virtue'?

By the time the reader finishes the editor's Advertisement, a tone of militant criticism has been set. Warburton tells us, 'Together with his Works, he hath bequeathed me his DUNCES', and concludes with a curious statement, 'And though Rome permitted her Slaves to calumniate her best Citizens on the day of Triumph, yet the same petulancy at their Funeral would have been rewarded with execration and a gibbet.'<sup>3</sup> Warburton compounded the reader's burden by adding to the 1752 Advertisement a passage beginning, 'The Public may be malicious: but it is rarely vindictive or ungenerous', and ending with a cautionary second motto:

It would abhor these insults on a writer  
dead, tho' it had born with the ribaldry,  
or even set the ribalds on work, when he  
was alive. And in this there was no great  
harm: for he must have a strange impotency

<sup>3</sup>Pope, Works (1751), I, xii.



of mind whom such miserable scriblers [sic] can ruffle. Of all that gross Beotian phalanx who have written scurrilously against me, I know not so much as one whom a writer of reputation would not wish to have as his enemy, or whom a man of honour would not be ashamed to own for his friend. I am indeed but slightly conversant in their works, and know little of the particulars of their defamation. To my Authorship they are heartily welcome. But if any of them have been so abandoned by Truth as to attack my moral character in any instance whatsoever, to all and every one of these, and their abettors, I give the LYE in form, and in the words of honest Father Valerian, MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME.<sup>4</sup>

My third chapter will show to what extent Warburton's 'moral character' was impugned. Considerable though this extent may be, it hardly justifies any breach of editorial trust. Any editor of Pope's Works was bound to attract malicious criticism, especially from the survivors of the 1743 Dunciad. Warburton's name - yet not Pope's - appeared on this revised satire which left him vulnerable to countless attacks of aspiring wits. An unenviable position in many respects, yet Warburton stood to gain considerable profits for his troubles.

As Pope was the first author to make a successful living out of the sale of books, his literary executor and posthumous editor holds a unique position in the history of literature. Never before had a poet been able to exert some control over the publication of his works; and never before had an editor been chosen by an author to tend his estate.

<sup>4</sup>Pope, Works (1752), I, xii-xiii. The same 'MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME' ending appears in the 1753-57 advertisements. After Ruffhead's Life in the 1769 Works, the last paragraph was dropped.

## II

POPE,  
WARBURTON  
and

'the Great Edition of my things with your Notes'

I also give and bequeath to the said Mr. Warburton the property of all such of my Works already printed, as he hath written, or shall write Commentaries or Notes upon, and which I have not otherwise disposed of, or alienated; and all the profits which shall arise after my death from such editions as he shall publish without future alterations. [Works (1751), IX, 369]

The man to whom Pope bequeathed half of his library of printed books<sup>1</sup> and gave the responsibility of editing his works after death has not been generally remembered as some-

<sup>1</sup>Pope left the other half of his library to Ralph Allen after Bolingbroke had removed his own books and Martha Blount had selected 'three score' of her preference. Pope's will was widely published: first by Charles Corbett in 1744; again in the same year (but in an inferior printing) by Weaver Bickerton; and also in Gentleman's Magazine (June, 1744), XIV, 313-14. The above clause relating to Warburton is footnoted on the first page of the 1751 Advertisement in volume I.

one worthy of Pope's esteem. Sir Paul Harvey concluded his entry on William Warburton in The Oxford Companion to English Literature with the unprepossessing epithets, 'He was a bad scholar, a literary bully, and a man of untrustworthy character.' George S. Fraser went so far as to describe Warburton as 'loathsome' and 'in some ways the evil genius of Pope's last years'.<sup>2</sup> Contrasting Warburton's stern character with Spence's good-natured disposition, George Sherburn quipped, 'no one ever accused him of being sweet tempered', and of Warburton's Duncen-provoking stance in his advertisement to the 1751 Works, he added, 'Such a spirit as this evinces helped to deter the peace-loving from Pope studies.'<sup>3</sup> When F.W. Bateson considered the odd transformation of titles from Epistles to Several Persons to Moral Essays in the 1751 edition, he declared, 'Indeed for Warburton the editor there is almost nothing to be said.' Much of his editorial duty, Bateson thought, was 'to relieve the poems as far as possible from the load of Warburtonian incrustation.'<sup>4</sup>

Of the clause in Pope's will stipulating that his works

<sup>2</sup>George S. Fraser, Alexander Pope (London, 1978), 11; 105.

<sup>3</sup>George Sherburn, The Early Career of Alexander Pope (Oxford, 1934; reprinted 1968), 1.

<sup>4</sup>The Poems of Alexander Pope, Volume III ii, Epistles to Several Persons, edited by F.W. Bateson (London, 1951; second edition 1961), xv; xvi. [Hereafter referred to as Twickenham III ii.]



should be published 'without future alterations' Bateson said:

A certain officious "tidiness" was one of Warburton's most pronounced intellectual characteristics; the emendations in his edition of Shakespeare often seem prompted by a desire to clarify what no one has found obscure. During the period when the commentaries were being prepared Warburton frequently suggested "improvements" of this kind [i.e. changing the title of Epistles to Several Persons to Moral Essays] to Pope, and it was perhaps with a view to curbing this tendency that Pope inserted the special clause in his will assigning his copyright to Warburton provided he made no "future Alterations". Warburton apparently interpreted this clause to mean that he was to make no verbal changes in the poems. Short of this he seems to have felt himself at liberty to do anything he liked.<sup>5</sup>

Pope's decision to choose Warburton as his literary executor and posthumous editor has vexed critics and biographers alike almost since the day the two men met late in April 1740. Why not a less controversial, more scholarly person like Spence? Why not someone whom Pope had known longer and could be trusted to fulfil his wish that his works be given a fine and textually faithful and enduring form? Such questions are, of course, naive and unanswerable. Pope's reasons for selecting Warburton were ultimately his own, hence private; and like many other

<sup>5</sup> Twickenham III ii, xiv-xv.

aspects of his biography, the facts pertain while the motives lay veiled in mystery.<sup>6</sup> The poet's choice is documented in his will (which was witnessed by Spence); the editor's fulfillment is certified by the 1751 Works. For the most part the Warburton edition of Pope's Works was the most successful of its kind in the eighteenth century and continued to be published well into the nineteenth century. The accounts for the first five Warburton editions (which are given in Appendix B below) indicate that 10,750 sets of Pope's Works were sold between 1751 and 1755 at a net profit of £5203.18s.6½d. Such figures are unprecedented for their time. Even by today's standards a profit of £300,000 (which is the rough equivalent of the eighteenth-century sum<sup>7</sup>) for an edition of poetry seems incredible over a five-year time-span. Thus in financial terms Warburton had the highest possible incentive to fulfil his duties as literary executor. If Pope imagined that by choosing a polemical editor his fame would be more firmly perpetuated with each successive edition, then Warburton was the right man for the task.

<sup>6</sup> On, for example, the nature of Pope's relationship with Martha Blount - sexual or Platonic? - F.W. Bateson coyly offers two contradictory opinions. See John Barnard's commemorative article, 'F.W. Bateson, Pope, and Editing', in Essays in Criticism, 29, no. 2 (April 1979), 127.

<sup>7</sup> For conversion of eighteenth-century sums into 1982 currency, Roy Porter recommends multiplying by sixty. See his English Society in the Eighteenth Century (Harmondsworth, 1982), 13.

At least once in his life Pope thought of Warburton in uncomplimentary terms: 'W. is a sneaking Parson, & I told him he flattered.'<sup>8</sup> This remark, made by the poet in a letter to Martha Blount, followed what was presumably an unpleasant incident at Prior Park in late July or early August 1743. Had this rift (which parted Pope and Martha Blount on one side, Warburton and the Allens on the other) occurred earlier in Pope's acquaintance with Warburton, perhaps Pope might have appointed someone else to be his literary executor. However, the breach was only temporary. Within a month Pope had written two letters<sup>9</sup> to Ralph Allen, presumably by way of apology, and was recommencing literary arrangements with Warburton. Pope's letter of 4 September 1743 to Warburton ends with the sort of high-flown salutation which characterizes much of their earlier correspondence: 'You may be assured that no man is more zealously yours, or will be more sincere with you than Dear Sir Your faithfull & affect: Servant.' Correspondence was soon back to normal. To Ralph Allen Pope was recounting his relapse of health on 13 September and to Warburton he was writing about giving Bowyer the Essay on Criticism commentary and bidding him to order as many copies of the quarto Dunciad as he wanted. Work on 'the Great Edition' was proceeding as planned.

<sup>8</sup>Correspondence, edited by George Sherburn, 5 volumes (Oxford, 1956), IV, 464. [Hereafter referred to as Corr.]

<sup>9</sup>These two letters are mentioned in Pope's letter to Warburton (4 September 1743); they have not survived.

One is tempted to ask what brought Pope and Warburton together and what kept these two men of such diverse characters, temperaments, and backgrounds from falling out after their first discord. The desire to lend one another sorts of immortality - Pope's as a poet, Warburton's as his defender - is an obvious motive; attraction of opposites offers another possibility. Perhaps Pope felt Warburton was the only suitable or most efficient person for the job of assembling his literary effects into a lasting form. Any psychological 'reading' of their relationship must be approached with caution, treated tentatively, and regarded ultimately as incomplete. The only main narrative available is epistolary, and as such, an interpretation of Pope's relationship with Warburton through their correspondence will be subject to such difficulties as hiatus (non-extant letters), imbalance (more of Pope's letters have been preserved than Warburton's), and tonal inference (e.g. is the writer sneering behind his pen or is he serious?). How accurately can the modern reader gauge mid-eighteenth century manners, customs of hospitality, forms of patronage, or hyperbolic adulation? When Pope says 'W. is a sneaking Parson, & I told him he flatterd' is he expressing an honest opinion or is he attempting to appease Martha Blount by siding with her over the hazy circumstances which prompted them to leave Prior Park? And when Warburton adds his title note to the 1751 To a Lady (Works III, 193) which states that

'no one character in it was drawn from the life' is he following Pope's request to maintain a sense of anonymity or is he satisfying his own wishes, as Bateson conjectures, 'partly to deprive Martha Blount (his principal rival in Pope's affections) of literary glory; and partly to propitiate Mrs Allen, whose niece Warburton had married and who had quarrelled with Martha'?<sup>10</sup> Such questions perplex the modern biographer.

Misinterpretations arise even from such a relatively straight-forward document as Pope's will. Dr Johnson, who combined a close proximity to first-hand sources with 'a human wisdom in dealing with human instability that all biographers must envy',<sup>11</sup> followed Ruffhead's assumption that the clause concerning Ralph Allen in Pope's will was an affront:

He brought some reproach upon his own memory by the petulant and contemptuous mention made in his will of Mr. Allen, and an affected repayment of his benefactions. Mrs. Blount, as the known friend and favourite of Pope, had been invited to the house of Allen, where she comported herself with such indecent arrogance that she parted from Mrs. Allen in a state of irreconcilable dislike, and the door was for ever barred against her. This exclusion she resented with so much bitterness as to refuse any legacy from Pope, unless he left the world

<sup>10</sup>Twickenham III ii, 46-47, n. 1.

<sup>11</sup>George Sherburn, The Early Career of Alexander Pope (Oxford, 1934; reprinted 1968), 15. [Hereafter referred to as Early Career.]

with a disavowal of obligation to Allen. Having been long under her dominion, now tottering in the decline of life and unable to resist the violence of her temper, or, perhaps with the prejudice of a lover, persuaded that she had suffered improper treatment, he complied with her demand and polluted his will with female resentment. Allen accepted the legacy, which he gave to the Hospital at Bath; observing that Pope was always a bad accomptant, and that if to 150<sup>l</sup>. he had put a cypher more, he had come nearer the truth.<sup>12</sup>

Against this account of the Prior Park episode and the subsequent effect on Pope's will (which derives ultimately from Warburton) must be balanced Martha Blount's version which was recorded by Spence on 27 May 1749.

They [the Allens] had often invited me to their house, and as I went to Bristol with Lady [Gerard] for some time while Mr. Pope was with them, I took that time of paying the visit they had desired. I soon observed a strangeness of behaviour in them. They used Mr. Pope very rudely, and Mr. Warburton with double complaisance (to make their ill-usage of the other the more apparent). Me they used oddly, in a very stiff, and over-civil manner. I asked Mr. Pope after I had been there three or four days, whether he had observed their usage of him. He said he had taken no notice of it, but a day or two after, he said that 'the people had got some odd thing or another in their heads.' This oddness continued, or rather increased, as long as they stayed.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Samuel Johnson, Lives of the English Poets, edited by George Birkbeck Hill, 3 vols (Oxford, 1905), III, 195-96. [Hereafter referred to as 'Life of Pope'.]

<sup>13</sup> Joseph Spence, Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men, edited by James M. Osborn, 2 vols (Oxford, 1966), I, 159. [Hereafter referred to as Anecdotes.]



In an earlier anecdote, Martha Blount referred to the clause in Pope's will relating to his bequeathal of £150 to Ralph Allen, saying 'I had never read his will, but he mentioned to me the part relating to Mr. Allen, and I desired him to omit it, but could not prevail on him.'

Would Pope have 'polluted his will' to appease the smouldering resentment of Martha Blount? And if so, would she not have attempted to influence him as far as Warburton was concerned? Sherburn records fourteen letters between Pope and Allen from the time of the Prior Park visit to Pope's death. Pope makes frequent solicitations after Allen's and his wife's health. Five days before he had his will drawn up and witnessed on 12 December 1743, Pope wrote to Allen with his customary civility, saying 'I heartily thank you for acquainting me of Mrs Allens recovery, which I was anxious to know, & for the Confirmation of your owne, which no Friend you have can desire with more ardor.' There is a possible allusion made to the summer mishap:

I was sure you would not wrong, or even do the Shadow of a Wrong, to him or any one else, unless it upon some Mis-information, or Mistake; & then it would be set right, upon a few plain words, spoken (as I dare say yours always will be) with Truth and Openness. I do verily think he [Dr Oliver] would not do or say any thing ill in your regard, he is certainly an ingenious, and

(I think) a Charitable & friendly man, notwithstanding some little things, which you & I may wish mended, but few can mend, & all must overlook in one another.<sup>14</sup>

Pope's last letter to Allen from Chelsea College (where he was being treated by Cheselden and Burton three weeks before his death) bears no hint of animosity and ends with the wish that 'both you and I shall preserve the friendship [sic] of all we know.'<sup>15</sup>

If Pope had wanted to spite Allen after his death, would he not have omitted his name entirely from his will, following Martha Blount's advice although, perhaps, for a different reason? The £150 legacy seems to have been Pope's repayment of a loan from Allen made in January 1739 on behalf of the poet's nephew, Michael Rackett, who wanted to buy a commission. It was understood from Pope's will that the money would be given to Bath hospital; one was exchanging charity for charity. If the repaid amount fell far short of Allen's benefactions, it was perhaps unintentional. Wealthy, 'Humble Allen' certainly needed no windfalls from Pope. In addition to the meagre sum, Pope bequeathed to Allen half his library of printed books. Maynard Mack, in his biographical survey of books owned by Pope, estimates that the Pope library contained

<sup>14</sup>Corr., IV, 486 (8 December [1743]).

<sup>15</sup>Corr., IV, 522 (7 May [1744]).

between five hundred and seven hundred and fifty volumes, 'perhaps higher'.<sup>16</sup> Taking into account 'all the volumes of my Works and Translations of Homer, bound in red morocco, and the eleven volumes of those of Erasmus' (to go to Bolingbroke, who was also asked to take back any books which Pope had borrowed from him), 'the large paper edition of Thuanus, by Buckley' (to go to Marchmont), and the sixty volumes of Martha Blount's choice, Allen would have received between two and three hundred books as a memento of Pope's esteem. Such a bequest from the foremost poet of the realm must have been regarded as fair compensation for any outstanding debt.<sup>17</sup>

Martha Blount received the lion's share of Pope's fortune - £1000 'immediately on my decease' as well as £1700 in trust - although 'Everybody thought Mr. Pope worth a great deal more than he left behind him.'<sup>18</sup> In the long run, however, Warburton, who received no actual money from Pope's will, stood to gain the most. Dr Johnson said that Pope left his editor 'a legacy which may be reasonably estimated at four thousand pounds' in

<sup>16</sup>Maynard Mack, 'Pope's Books: A Biographical Survey with a Finding List' and 'Appendix', in English Literature in the Age of Disguise, edited by Maximillian E. Novak (London, 1977), pp. 209-305 (pp. 209, 213). [See note 46 below.]

<sup>17</sup>Allen's share of Pope's library would be inherited by Warburton, the other co-recipient, in 1764. Some volumes were given away as gifts; others were bought by Hurd for the Hartlebury Castle collection.

<sup>18</sup>Spence, Anecdotes, I, 158.

his 1781 Life of Pope.<sup>19</sup> Warburton acquired his legacy gradually and through much hard effort, but he does not seem to have been disappointed by the will. Perhaps appropriately, Pope's last testament left his best contemporary critic and busy recorder of conversation, Joseph Spence, nothing but a witness.

\*\*\*

Pope first came into contact with Warburton over the Essay on Man controversy in the late 1730s. The four epistles of the Essay were published anonymously between February 1733 and January 1734, and their authorship was ascribed to various writers - Young, Desaguliers, Bolingbroke, Paget - every known philosophical figure but Pope.<sup>20</sup> One reason for the general slowness of the public to recognize the Essay as Pope's is that he was known to be busy elsewhere. In the same month as the appearance of the first epistle of the Essay, Pope published Satire II i, the first of his Horatian imitations, in response to 'the Clamour raised on some of my Epistles', more specifically, the epistles to Bathurst and Burlington.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup>Johnson, 'Life of Pope', III, 170.

<sup>20</sup>Pope, Works (1751), IV, 34, n. 282.

<sup>21</sup>Satire II i, Advertisement, Twickenham IV, 3.

If people were talking about Pope (as they no doubt were), it was in terms of satire, not ethical systems. Who were Timon and Balaam likely to be? What replies might be expected from Sappho and Delia? How lacerating would the Verses Address'd to the Imitator be? Prolificity provided a good smoke-screen for the Essay on Man, although Pope's diversion may have been too successful for his own satisfaction. Still, while people were guessing who wrote the Essay, Pope enjoyed the fulsome praise of his erstwhile victims of The Dunciad. The first hint of Pope's connection with the Essay was given in an epigram in the Universal Spectator on 23 June 1733 which was later reprinted in the Gentleman's Magazine.<sup>22</sup> Voltaire, who was later inspired to write his Discours en vers sur l'homme, knew of Pope's authorship on the continent by 24 July 1733.<sup>23</sup> Virtually no adverse criticism was raised against the Essay by the English press in the early years of its publication. With the appearance of Works II in April 1735, Pope formally announced that An Essay on Man was his own.

Early in 1736 appeared a French translation of the Essay in prose by Etienne de Silhouette which ran through four editions in one year. Although Silhouette warned his

<sup>22</sup>Gentleman's Magazine (1733), III, 319.

<sup>23</sup>Twickenham III i, xvi, n. 2. The following discussion owes much to Mack's research in his introduction to the Essay on Man, especially xv-xxii.

readers about apparent elements of 'Spinosisme', the translation was warmly recommended by Tournemine, an influential Jesuit. Mémoires de Trévoux published a favourable review of the Silhouette translation in June 1736, but with certain reservations about Pope's religious tendencies: the Essay seemed to avoid mentioning revelation and the doctrine of original sin. Still, for the time being, Tournemine's impression that the Essay reflected '"un philosophe profond & un poète vraiment sublime"' was allowed to prevail.<sup>24</sup>

At Voltaire's instigation, Du Resnel translated the Essay into French verse, and this apparently precipitated the galling condemnation by Mémoires de Trévoux in March 1737.<sup>25</sup> Du Resnel took various liberties with the original English text, adding some seven hundred lines to Pope's Essay.

Consequently, a multitude of passages in the poem had to be deleted, others added, still others transposed, expanded, or contracted, and the whole so altered as to become substantially unrecognizable as Pope's. Even the title was changed to imply something especially ambitious: having decided on a reimpression of his translation of the Essay on Criticism Du Resnel issued the two together in one volume as

<sup>24</sup>Twickenham III i, xviii.

<sup>25</sup>See 'An Essay on Man and France' by Gerald Steel in Alexander Pope's An Essay on Man (Epistle IV) (Milton Keynes, 1979), pp. 37-42 [Open University, A204: The Enlightenment, Unit 3].



Les Principes de la Morale et du Goût.<sup>26</sup>

Although Pope initially must have been pleased that his Essay was receiving wide-spread recognition on the continent, he was soon to be dismayed by the repercussions of these two French translations. While writing the Essay, he had taken special care to 'remove all occasion of scandal' by seeking the advice of John Caryl<sup>27</sup> and Bishop Berkeley.<sup>28</sup> For obvious reasons, Pope had no control over the Essay's French counterparts.

Jean-Pierre de Crousaz, a Swiss professor of philosophy and 'Membre des Académies Royales des Sciences de Paris & de Bourdeaux', published a lengthy Examen de l'Essai de M. Pope sur l'Homme based on the Silhouette translation in 1737; and when the Du Resnel verse translation appeared, Crousaz renewed his attack on Pope with an even longer Commentaire sur la traduction en vers . . . de l'Essai . . . sur l'Homme in 1738. With the liberties taken by Du Resnel, as Mack points out, 'The result was that Crousaz devoted a substantial part of his labours to the criticism of expressions that had no existence in the English poem and of pro-

<sup>26</sup> Twickenham III i, xix.

<sup>27</sup> See Pope's letters to Caryl on 23 October 1733 and 1 January 1734, Correspondence III, 390, 400.

<sup>28</sup> Spence, Anecdotes, I, 135-36. Pope told Spence in 1734, 'In the Moral Poem [Essay on Man] I had written an address to our Saviour, imitated from Lucretius' compliment to Epicurus, but omitted it by the advice of Dean Berkeley.' Berkeley's influence on Pope, as Osborn notes, 'has not been generally realized'.

positions which his victim would have found as laughable as he.<sup>29</sup>

London publishers were quick to capitalize on the Crousaz attacks. In the same month - November 1738 - both attacks were announced in the press: the Daily Advertiser ran notices of the Commentaire translation on 22, 25, and 27 November (naming Charles Forman as the translator on the 27th); and the General Evening Post advertised Elizabeth Carter's translation of the Examen (printed for A. Dodd) on 23 November.<sup>30</sup> Forman's A Commentary upon Mr. Pope's Four Ethic Epistles, also advertised in the November issue of London Magazine, provided only a condensed version of Crousaz's attack on the first epistle of An Essay on Man, although the preface mentioned that the commentary on the second epistle was in the press.<sup>31</sup> As this translation was published by Edmund Curll, who was always ready to goad Pope (especially after the publication of the poet's letters), it was prefaced with 'a triumphantly sardonic challenge', although its contents were not deliberately slanted against Pope.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup>Twickenham III i, xix-xx.

<sup>30</sup>For these dates, I have relied on Mack, *ibid.*, and Joseph Guerinot, Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope: 1711-1744: A Descriptive Bibliography (London, 1969), pp. 273-74. [Hereafter referred to as Pamphlet Attacks.]

<sup>31</sup>Pamphlet Attacks, p. 274.

<sup>32</sup>Twickenham III i, xx, n. 4.

Similarly, Elizabeth Carter's An Examination of Mr Pope's Essay on Man, a much longer and more scholarly translation, gave Pope fair treatment. Edward Cave, who induced the young blue-stocking to try her hand at the Crousaz Examen, also had another new writer in his Gentleman's Magazine stable at work on the Commentaire. Samuel Johnson's translation, however, was put aside when Curll announced the Forman Commentary.<sup>33</sup> Whether Curll had plundered Cave's idea or had simply struck upon the same money-making inspiration, Cave was obliged to push the Carter translation ahead. When it became apparent that Curll was not going to follow up the Forman translation with further instalments, Cave resumed plans to publish Johnson's complete translation.

One reason that Cave and Johnson decided to take the risk and go on with their version was that Forman's treatment of the text was far from satisfactory. Crousaz had relied throughout on a faulty translation of the Essay on Man made by the Abbé du Resnel, so that Pope's meaning was often completely misinterpreted. Forman had merely inserted Pope's own lines into the text, thus rendering many of the remarks of the Swiss theologian unintelligible. Johnson, much more sensibly, planned to include du Resnel's French version of the couplets, together with a literal English translation in a kind of rhythmic prose. Moreover, Johnson planned to treat all four parts of the Commentary.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> See James L. Clifford, Young Sam Johnson (London, 1955; reprinted 1957), pp. 195-98, for an account of Cave's project.

<sup>34</sup> Clifford, Young Sam Johnson, p. 196.

When it finally appeared, Johnson's Commentary met with dismal sales: the moment of public interest had been lost.<sup>35</sup> But the significance of his Crousaz translation lies in the fact that 'it was the first published volume containing any of Johnson's literary criticism.'<sup>36</sup> As translator and editor, Johnson tackled Crousaz on solid critical grounds and demonstrated the kind of healthy scepticism which was to reach its fullest form in his Life of Pope.

Curll made one more attempt to capitalize on the Crousaz attacks. In December 1740 he published Miscellanies in Prose and Verse, by the Honourable Lady Margaret Pennyman, the preface to which made mention of Crousaz's ignorance of English as well as his reliance on the faulty Du Resnel text.<sup>37</sup> It would seem that Curll was sensible enough not to challenge the popular opinion of An Essay on Man in England; on the other hand, he may have hoped for a reaction from Pope to stimulate further publication on the matter. There is more than a hint of chauvinism in his challenge:

<sup>35</sup> Clifford reports finding one copy of Johnson's Commentary with a title page dated 1739, 'yet no publication date has ever been discovered' (Young Sam Johnson, p. 196). It seems that the book was shelved until November 1741, at which time it was reissued with a 1742 title page. See also Guerinot, Pamphlet Attacks, pp. 281-82.

<sup>36</sup> Clifford, Young Sam Johnson, p. 195.

<sup>37</sup> Pamphlet Attacks, p. 275. Miscellanies incorporated unsold sheets of the Forman Commentary.

But still there is enough of the Commentary which may much more properly be called a Critical Satire of the Essay on Man, to set Mr. Pope to work; and had we not been persuaded, that he will think his Honour engaged to make some Reply or other, to the heavy Charge brought against him by a Frenchman, we would have enlarged the Remarks we made in translating Crousaz . . .<sup>38</sup>

Still, as Guerinot points out, remarks like 'All this is the pert Babble of a Frenchman; the Original [Essay on Man] no way authorizes it . . . ' were intended to uphold the reputation of the English Boileau, although this style of defence may not have entirely met with Pope's liking. He evidently felt it would be in bad taste to publish his own statement about the Crousaz attacks. Yet while the book-trade busied itself with translations which, on the whole, treated Pope favourably, any defence may have seemed peripheral. Book-buyers presumably purchased the translations because they had heard of an attack launched from the continent on a popular English poem: had Pope fallen from his pedestal? The main selling point of the translations was their controversial viewpoint; the salvaging of Pope's reputation was a secondary motive, consigned to prefaces and commentaries.

This long chain of publications - from the first appearance of the Essay on Man to the two French translations,

<sup>38</sup>Pamphlet Attacks, p. 275.

from the Lausanne attacks back to the English booksellers - ultimately linked Pope and Warburton as poet and editor. While Cave and Curll were rushing Crousaz into print, Warburton was independently compiling a refutation of the Swiss theologian in the History of the Works of the Learned. In five consecutive numbers between December 1738 and April 1739, Warburton elaborated his case that (to adapt the observation made by King George II) was to make Pope a Christian and himself a bishop. Whatever effect the Crousaz attacks and their London offshoots had on Pope's confidence in his perhaps most unassailable poem (which was dedicated to the man he most esteemed as a friend and philosopher), the author of An Essay on Man was greatly relieved when a defender arose almost out of nowhere. Within a year of Warburton's first letter, Pope was able to distribute copies of A Vindication of Mr. Pope's Essay on Man, from the Misrepresentations of Mr. Crousaz to his friends:

Your accidental mention of the ill use some infidels would be glad to make of my writings, makes me send you a book just published by a person utterly a stranger to me, though not to my meaning, in which he has perfectly explained me in a vindication of the Essay on Man, from the aspersions and mistakes of Mr. Crousaz; it shall come to you by the post, in one or two parcels, franked, and I believe will be some satisfaction to you and others upon that head.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup>Pope to Henry Brooke, 1 December 1739, Corr. IV, 207-08.



Pope's description to Brooke of Warburton as 'a person utterly a stranger to me' was, by December 1739, something of an exaggeration. Although Pope had yet to meet his future editor, he had already written four letters to Warburton, the first of which closed with the salutation, 'I am, Sir, with a due Esteem for your Abilities & for your Candor, (both which I am no Stranger to, from your other Writings, as well as this [i.e. the first or second letter published in the History of the Works of the Learned])'.<sup>40</sup> By the time his second letter was sent to Warburton on 11 April 1739, Pope was making sure Warburton would not remain a stranger for long.

\*\*\*\*

Pope's acquaintance with Warburton lasted just over four years - from late in April 1740 to Pope's death on 30 May 1744. Their correspondence, which amounts to sixty-seven letters in the Sherburn edition, began on 2 February 1739. That some fifteen months elapsed between first letter and first meeting may simply have been a matter of distance: Warburton held a living at Brant-Broughton (or 'Bruton' as Pope wrote it) near Newark in Nottinghamshire from 1728 until 1746. Apart

<sup>40</sup> Pope to Warburton, 2 February 1739, Corr. IV, 164.

from his clerical responsibilities, his literary circle, and the desire to continue with his Divine Legation of Moses, Warburton had his mother and sisters to attend to. Warburton's devotion to his mother, like Pope's, was profoundly deep, and before Elizabeth Warburton finally died in 1749, her only surviving son described her as 'my dearest, my incomparable mother, whom I do more than love, whom I adore'.<sup>41</sup> Travelling to London in 1739 may have been difficult for Warburton; and when Pope addressed a letter to him in care of 'Mr Robinson A Bookseller near Hungerford Market' on 4 January 1740,<sup>42</sup> the poet had been taking the waters at Bristol and Bath since mid-November and was to remain as Allen's guest until mid-February. While the delay in meeting may have allowed Pope to make much of Warburton's unsolicited and initially anonymous defence, he was nonetheless eager to meet his vindicator. Whether Warburton had, in the winter of 1739-40, sent Pope a note identifying himself as the author of the Crousaz counter-attack or Pope had enquired after the name of his defender from Jacob Robinson (who published The History of the Works of the Learned and had previously figured in the legal fracas over the publication of Pope's Letters<sup>43</sup>),

<sup>41</sup> A.W. Evans, Warburton and the Warburtonians (Oxford, 1932), p. 5. [Hereafter referred to as Evans]

<sup>42</sup> Corr. IV, 216.

<sup>43</sup> See Pope's letter to Nathaniel Cole, 18 November 1737, Corr. IV, 87-88: 'and the said Jacob Robinson did tell R[obert] Dodsley he could help him to the said impr[ession]...'

it did not take long for Pope to find out who Warburton was.

It is curious that Warburton did not publish Pope's first letter to him in the 1751 Works or in any subsequent edition, although he did allow Ruffhead to quote the first paragraph in his 1769 Life.<sup>44</sup> Pope's first recorded words to Warburton convey a sense of deference and gratitude:

Sir,—I cannot forbear to return you my thanks for your Animadversions on Mr Crousaz: tho' I doubt not, it was less a Regard to me, than to Candor & Truth, which made you take the pains to answer so Mistaken a Man.<sup>45</sup>

Although he was not above arranging his own publishing stratagems (vide his outmanoeuvring Curll in the Letters), Pope must have been relieved that matters concerning his public image had been taken out of his own hands: 'But this [the weakness in Crousaz's attack] is what I should never have Exposed myself, because it concern'd myself: And therefore I am the more oblig'd to You for doing it.' Any intention Pope may have had in mind for restoring his esteem would have been circumscribed by Warburton's apparently unprompted vindication. Pope's wish that Warburton continue writing on his behalf was expressed parenthetically: 'I will not give you the unnecessary trouble of adding here to the Defence you have made of me (tho much might be said

<sup>44</sup>Corr. IV, 164 n. 4.

<sup>45</sup>Corr. IV, 163-64.

on the article of the Passions in the Second Book)'.<sup>46</sup>

Blithely confessing his ignorance of Leibniz, Pope concluded his letter by praising Warburton's other writings.

What Pope might have read of Warburton's ecclesiastical output before 1739 could not have been awe-inspiring. The Alliance between Church and State (1736) put Warburton in good stead with the Whigs; and the first three books of the Divine Legation of Moses (1738) could not have held much interest for Pope. It would be difficult to imagine Pope buying any of Warburton's tracts. His library doesn't seem to have contained much in the way of Anglican theology.<sup>46</sup>

#### Warburton's First Patron

Pope might have found Warburton's first writings objectionable. In the year he was ordained deacon by the Archbishop of York - 1723 - Warburton published a volume of miscellaneous translations in verse and prose of Roman poets, orators and historians. This was dedicated to his patron, Sir Robert Sutton. When Sutton was expelled from the House of Commons on 4 May 1732 for his involvement in the Charitable Corporation scandal, Warburton came to his defence with An Apology for Sir Robert Sutton (1733). In his

<sup>46</sup>For the revised list of Pope's books, see Maynard Mack's 'A Finding List of Books Surviving from Pope's Library with a Few That May Not Have Survived' in Collected in Himself (Newark, Delaware, 1982), pp. 395-460. [N.B. note 16 above refers to the older but still useful list. This will hereafter be referred to as Mack, 'Pope's Books'.]

Epistle to Bathurst published the year before, Pope included Sutton at the end of a list of wealthy but notably uncharitable administrators:

Perhaps you think the Poor might have their part?  
 Bond damns the poor, and hates them from his heart:  
 The grave Sir Gilbert holds it for a rule,  
 That every man in want is knave or fool:  
 "God cannot love, (says Blunt, with lifted eyes)  
 "The wretch he starves"—and piously denies:  
 But rev'rend S \* \* n with a softer air,  
 Admits, and leaves them, Providence's care.<sup>47</sup>

Pope reaffirmed his impression of Sutton shortly before Warburton published his first letter in The History of the Works of the Learned. Given the diminished power of satire in Dialogue I (1738), Sutton's name was mentioned in a context of ironic equivocation:

But Horace, Sir, was delicate, was nice;  
 Bubo observes, he lash'd no sort of Vice:  
 Horace would say, Sir Billy serv'd the Crown,  
 Blunt could do Bus'ness, H—ggins knew the Town,  
 Sir George of some slight Gallantries suspect  
 In rev'rend S——n note a small Neglect. . .<sup>48</sup>

That Pope on both occasions described Sutton as 'rev'rend' (because he had once taken deacon's orders) and connected

<sup>47</sup> Epistle to Bathurst, ll. 101-08. This is quoted from Works II (1735). As will be discussed shortly, the reference to Sutton was later omitted. See Twickenham III ii, 98-100.

<sup>48</sup> Dialogue I, ll. 11-16, Twickenham IV, 298. This follows the text of 1738a. Sutton's name is given in full in 1738b and in the 1747 Ethic Epistles (which suggests this latter edition was unauthorized by Warburton).

him with Sir John Blunt, the 'Much injur'd' erstwhile director of the South-Sea Company, indicates the prolonged disdain he held for what the man had done. Sir Paul Methuen's line of defence for Sutton in the House of Commons which allowed 'though he was guilty of the grossest neglect in suffering rogues to cheat the poor, he was innocent of fraud',<sup>49</sup> furnished Pope with the satirically understated rhyme for 'suspect'.

Warburton met Sutton early on in his career at Averham Park near Newark. In 1727 - four years after the dedication of his Miscellaneous Translations to Sutton - Warburton was presented to the small living of Greaseley in Nottinghamshire. This was a seminal period for Warburton: he was ordained priest by the Bishop of London on 1 March 1727; his legal training came to good use when he was asked to assist Samuel Burroughs in The Legal Judicature in Chancery Stated (which concerned the debate between the powers of the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls); and his second book, again dedicated to Sutton, A Critical and Philosophical Enquiry into the Causes of Prodigies and Miracles (1727), was published. In the following year, Warburton was presented by Sutton to the more comfortable living of Brant Broughton, worth £560 p.a. Sutton also arranged for Warburton's name to be

<sup>49</sup> Twickenham IV, 298, n. 16. Emphasis Butt's, cited from Egmont Diary MSS I, Historical Manuscripts Commission, 63 (1920), 267 [Diary of Viscount Percival].



put on the list of honorary degrees which were conferred by George II during his visit to Cambridge in April 1728. Warburton could now enhance his title-pages with the letters A.M. His stipend was increased by £250 two years later when another influential patron, the Duke of Newcastle, offered him the combined benefices of Firsby and Great Steeping in Leicestershire which he held without residence, having resigned Greaseley in 1728, until 1756.<sup>50</sup>

If Warburton's first book (his only attempt at poetry) caused him some embarrassment because of its bad rhymes and faulty Latin dedication,<sup>51</sup> so too did A Critical and Philosophical Enquiry into the Causes of Prodigies and Miracles for a more substantial reason. Warburton concluded his second book with a tribute to Cambridge University:

METHINKS I see her, like the mighty  
Eagle, renewing her immortal Youth, and  
purging her opening Sight, at the unob-  
structed Beams of our benign Meridian SUN;  
which some pretend to say had been dazzled  
and abused by an inglorious pestilential  
METEOR; while the ill-affected Birds of  
Night wou'd, with their envious Hootings,  
prognosticate a length of Darkness and  
Decay.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>50</sup> Much of this information has been taken from Evans, chapters I-II; and Sir Leslie Stephen's article on Warburton in The Dictionary of National Biography [DNB].

<sup>51</sup> Evans, p. 13.

<sup>52</sup> [William Warburton], A Critical and Philosophical Enquiry into the Causes of Prodigies and Miracles (London, 1727), pp. 136-37.

This was found to bear too close a resemblance to the passage on a 'noble and puissant nation' in Milton's Areopagitica:

*Methinks I see her as an Eagle muing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazl'd eyes at the full midday beam; purging and unscaling her long abused sight at the fountain it self of heav'nly radiance; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amaz'd at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticat a year of sects and schisms.*<sup>53</sup>

According to Warburton in a letter which he sent to Hurd in 1757, he was 'very much a boy when I wrote that thing about prodigies, and I had never the courage to look into it since, so I have quite forgot all the nonsense that it contains'.<sup>54</sup> He maintained that he had given his manuscript to Matthew Concanen who, in turn, sold it 'for more money than you would think'. Years later, when Warburton's fame had been elevated by his association with Pope, Curll obtained the copyright of Prodigies and Miracles and informed the author of his intention to reprint it, thereby compelling Warburton to send Knapton to buy his own book back. Curll's

<sup>53</sup>The Works of John Milton, Volume IV, Areopagitica, edited by William Haller (New York, 1931), p. 344. Words which were borrowed by Warburton have been given in italics.

<sup>54</sup>Evans, p. 24. The text of this letter from Warburton to Hurd is taken from Letters of a Late Eminent Prelate (Kidderminster, [1808]), p. 159.

shrewd ploy worked: Warburton evidently wished to have his early work remain unknown. However, Prodigies and Miracles was included in the 1789 Tracts by Warburton and a Warburtonian.

If Pope had dipped into some of Warburton's works prior to their first meeting, he might have been amused by the irony that a book which started with a twenty-page dedication to the future director of the Charitable Corporation who was found guilty of embezzlement in 1732 ended with 'an audacious plagiarism'.<sup>55</sup>

The problem arising out of Warburton's connection with Sutton in relation to his later alliance with Pope is the subject of the one extant letter from Warburton to Pope in Sherburn's Correspondence. Although the letter is an undated fragment, it renders Warburton's case fully for the defence of his former patron. As Pope's reply is dated 27 January [1743/4], it would seem likely that Warburton sent his letter early in the New Year of 1744. Possibly Warburton wanted to make sure of Pope's intention of appointing him as his editor before broaching this delicate subject; at any rate, Warburton's editorship had been declared in writing the month before in Pope's will. Warburton's plea on Sutton's behalf evidently made a strong impression on Pope's mind, as he wrote, 'I will omit the

<sup>55</sup> Evans, p. 23; Stephen, DNB, 'Warburton', p. 759.

Person's Name to whom you shew favour, in this Edition'.<sup>56</sup> Accordingly, the two references to Sutton were replaced with 'the good Bishop' in the 1744 'death-bed' edition of the Epistle to Bathurst and 'rev'rend Bishops' in the 1751 text of Dialogue I in the fourth volume of Pope's Works.<sup>57</sup> That Warburton acted properly in this regard is beyond doubt. He felt his former patron was being misrepresented by Pope, and rather than making an unauthorized textual alteration after the poet's death, he brought the matter into the open. As Sutton survived Pope by two years, he may have felt somewhat exonerated; and Warburton, having obtained Pope's permission, could not be accused of an editorial trespass in this conflict of interests.<sup>58</sup> The references to Sutton - which Warburton had presumably not been in a strong enough position to alter in the editions of the Works II i of 1740 and 1743 - could now be removed.

The immediate occasion of Warburton's letter about Sutton was the printing of Epistles to Several Persons for which Pope had asked him to provide notes and comment-

<sup>56</sup> Corr. IV, 495-96 (27 January [1743/4]).

<sup>57</sup> Another Sutton is referred to in Donne II, l. 36: 'Who live like S—tt—n, or who die like Chartres,' (Twickenham IV, 135) although this was intended for General Richard Sutton (d. 1737) who acquired the epithet 'Satan, Governor of Hell' for his debauchery (Ibid, 385). Warburton did not alter this line in the 1751 Works IV.

<sup>58</sup> In transferring the specific name 'Sutton' to the non-specific 'Bishop' (thereby disrupting the contextual sequence of named figures), might Pope have been making an ironic prediction about his editor's promotion?

aries. Although Pope asked Bowyer to delay 'printing the Comment on the Use of Riches',<sup>59</sup> as late as March 1744, Warburton did not add a note explaining the textual alteration until the 1751 edition of the Works:

In this place, and in the first Dialogue of 1738, the Poet had named a very worthy Person of condition, who for a course of many years had shined in public Stations much to the advantage and honour of his Country. But being at once oppressed by popular prejudice and a public censure, it was no wonder, the poet, to whom he was personally a stranger, should think hardly of him. I had the honour to be well known to this truly illustrious Person, and to be greatly obliged by him. From my intimate knowledge of his Character, I was fully persuaded of his innocence, and that he was unwarily drawn in by a pack of infamous Cheats, to his great loss of fortune as well as reputation. At my request, therefore, the poet with much satisfaction retracted, and struck out, in both places, his ill-grounded censure. I have since had the pleasure to understand, from the best authority, that my favourable sentiments of him have lately been fully justified in the course of some proceedings in the high court of Chancery, the most unerring investigator of Truth and Falsehood.<sup>60</sup>

One cannot help wondering by the end of reading this whether Warburton is considering going back to his old profession - the law. As we shall soon see, he not only lengthens his case with all the dexterity of a Jarndyce and Jarndyce attorney, but he contorts his facts as well.

<sup>59</sup> Corr. IV, 506.      <sup>60</sup> Pope, Works (1751), III, 230-31n.

Warburton's letter to Pope, which was not published until 1788 by Hurd<sup>61</sup>, opens in a straightforward manner:

I have known this Gentleman about twenty years. I have been greatly and in the most generous manner obliged to him. So I am very capable, and you will readily believe, very much disposed to apologize for him. Yet for all that, if I did not really believe him to be an honest man, I would not venture to excuse him to you.<sup>62</sup>

Mentioning Sutton's 'faithful and able discharge of a long embassy at Constantinople', Warburton then examines the main blemish on his former patron's career:

The first reflexion on his character was that unhappy affair of the Charitable-corporation. I read carefully all the reports of the committee concerning it: And as I knew Sir Robert Sutton's temper and character so well, I was better able than most to judge of the nature of his conduct in it. And I do in my conscience believe that he had no more suspicion of any fraud, carrying on by some in the direction, than I had. That he was guilty of neglect and negligence, as a Director, is certain: but it was only the natural effect of his temper (where he has no suspicion) which is exceedingly indolent. And he suffered sufficiently for it, not only in his censure, but by the loss of near £20,000. And at this very juncture he lost a considerable sum of money (through his negligence) by the villainy of a land-steward, who broke and run away. Dr. Arbuthnot knew him well; and I am fully persuaded, though I never heard so, that he had the same opinion of him in this affair that I have.

<sup>61</sup> Warburton, Works, edited by Richard Hurd, I (1788), 143.

<sup>62</sup> Corr. IV, 492.



Nothing in Warburton's letter contradicts Pope's lines on Sutton. If anything, Warburton admits, Sutton was guilty of 'neglect and negligence, as a Director', and this was how Pope immortalized Sutton in the Epistle to Bathurst and Dialogue I. Yet Warburton was zealous to protect the reputation of his former patron from the popular impression that he may have been more than merely negligent in the management of the Charitable Corporation. It is the underlying sense of satirical jeering - that Sutton was guilty by association with Bond and others of having a hand in the till - that bothers Warburton.

Warburton more or less skirts over the main issue of the Charitable Corporation scandal, dismissing the parliamentary committee reports and assuming he is best qualified to assess Sutton's behaviour. Knowing someone for twenty years is, by the logic of Warburton's defence, ipso facto a better reason for speaking on his behalf in such complex circumstances. Warburton assumes a powerful (but long dead) ally in this regard: Arbuthnot would have confirmed Warburton's impression. Given Pope's intimate acquaintance with Arbuthnot, Warburton adds the rhetorical qualifier, 'I am fully persuaded, though I never heard so'. The Sutton case, maintains Warburton, 'became a party matter. And the violence of parties no one knows more of than yourself'. Omitting to mention Sutton's association with the other, more culpable, directors, Warburton remarks on the notoriety of Sutton's

profligate brother, Richard, which was used against him during the parliamentary investigation. The more 'rev'rend' brother, Warburton goes on to say, was (like Ralph Allen) 'born to no fortune', acquired his wealth through honest means, and 'is an extreme good and faithful husband'. Having adopted the modes of barrister and character witness, Warburton now dons his cassock for the summation of his defence. 'My parishioners are good people', he declares, almost implying that Sir Robert is as much a shepherd to his flock as Warburton is. If Sutton is guilty, Warburton is ready to write a sermon on the guilt of us all. In the past he has granted abatements to his tenants during hard times; and his benefice to Warburton was given 'without any consideration to party or election—interest'. Soon after Sutton presented Warburton to his first living, he informed him that his predecessor 'was going to commence a suit for his just dues', and Sutton suggested that Warburton ought to pursue an increase in his stipend which ultimately would come out of his own pocket. Could there be, one reads between the lines, a more Christian man in the realm?

In a word, there is nothing I am more convinced of than the innocence of Sir R.S. in the case of the Charitable Corporation, as to any fraud, or connivance at fraud. You, who always follow your judgment, free from prejudice, will do so here. I have discharged my duty of friendship both to you and him.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>63</sup>Corr. IV, 494.

The Charitable Corporation, incorporated in 1707, was originally set up to provide 'Relief of Industrious Poor, by assisting them with small Sums upon Pledges'.<sup>64</sup> Sir Robert Sutton was nominated as a director on 25 October 1725. At the time of the select committee investigation, Sutton was, along with Denis Bond and Archibald Grant, one of the Corporation's longest standing governors. The early numbers of the Gentleman's Magazine record the growing concern that the Corporation was not properly fulfilling its commitments. High interest rates put the loan scheme out of reach; a borrower of £150 would have to pay back £40 within three months, although the usual interest rate hovered around ten per cent. By the end of 1731, it was reported that nearly £100,000 had been embezzled.<sup>65</sup> Memories of the widows who had invested their life savings in the South-Sea Company (and who, a decade later, had yet to be reimbursed) were rekindled. Figures of the losses sky-rocketed: an early report gave £159,000; 'A State of the Loss sustained by the Charitable Corporation to the 15th of February, 1731-2' came to £421,825.6s.9¼d; when the books were reassessed for the 1733 parliamentary report, the figure leapt another £66,000 to £487,895.14s.10¾d, 'owing to the Difference between

<sup>64</sup> House of Commons Sessional Papers of the Eighteenth Century, edited by Sheila Lambert, George II, vol. XIV, Charitable Corporation, 1732-1734 (Wilmington, Delaware, 1975). This contains four published reports of the select committee's investigation into the Charitable Corporation scandal.

<sup>65</sup> See Gentleman's Magazine, I (March 1731), 106, (December), 516; II (January 1732), 579 (February), 665.

the Valuation of the Goods pledged, and what they sold for; the Expences of the Corporation since that Time [February 1731]; and the Insufficiencies of the Securities of George Robinson and John Thomson'.<sup>66</sup> George Robinson was one of the assistants of the Corporation, and John Thomson occupied the vital position of Warehouse Keeper of the Corporation House at Lawrence Pountney Hill from which disbursements were made. Both were given equal authority with the directors and were allowed to authorize transactions of up to £2000 at one time. The parliamentary investigation discovered an accumulated debt of £22,000 by one of Robinson's servants; and a menial servant of the Corporation, Nathaniel Lovell, was allowed to borrow £2,500 in one day. Thomson was found with a pre-signed blank cheque-book in his possession. The opportunity for flagrant abuse was given by the directors. Appended to the 1733 report were six letters between Sutton and Thomson concerning speculation in Corporation shares. After the initial enquiry, a bill was passed restraining Sutton and other directors from leaving the kingdom under penalty of imprisonment in the Fleet and 'suffering Death as Felons'. Sutton, Grant, and Bond pleaded their innocence by virtue of their frequent absences, but the committee

<sup>66</sup>House of Commons Sessional Papers, 'The Report, with the Appendix, from the Committee, to whom the Petition of the Proprietors of the Charitable Corporation. . . was referred' (1733), p. 539.

found it inexcusable that Robinson and Thomson had been allowed a free hand in the till.

Sutton's name seems to have become a by-word for the pitiabile millionaire. Pope cited him ironically in a letter to Peterborough in May 1732:

but as to the things of this world, I find my self in a condition beyond expectation; it being evident from a late Parliamentary inquiry, that I have as much ready money, as much in funds, and as great a personal estate,, as Sir Robert S—tt—n.<sup>67</sup>

Whether Pope knew of people who were directly affected by the Charitable Corporation scandal or simply thought it an updated version of the South-Sea Bubble, his moral indignation at an institution which was intended to assist the poor but ended up lining the pockets of a select few was justifiably aroused. Sutton's 'small Neglect' had monstrous consequences. When he wrote 'Bond damns the Poor' in his Epistle to Bathurst, he was reiterating what had already been recorded in newsprint:

That the coining of Notes and Bonds being remonstrated against as inconsistent with their Charter for relieving the Poor, a Manager said, Damn the Poor, let's go into the City, and get Money for ourselves.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Corr. III, 282.

<sup>68</sup> Gentleman's Magazine, II (May 1732), 767.



It is no surprise, then, that Pope made a niche for the main figures of the Charitable Corporation scandal in his 'Ethic Epistle' which was originally entitled Of the Use of Riches. On the scale of avarice between Chartres and Balaam (full) and the Man of Ross and Bathurst (none), the Charitable Corporation directors provided worthy exemplars of the lower range, especially in the abuse of pledges:

Blest paper-credit! last and best supply!  
That lends Corruption lighter wings to fly!  
(Bathurst, ll. 69-70)

As Pope had begun writing his Epistle to Bathurst in 1730, the scandal which blew up late in 1731 afforded him ample opportunity to flesh out his poem with an appropriate and immediate example of institutionalized corruption. That the poem was not published until 15 January 1733 (over seven months after the first parliamentary reports and a fortnight before the second report on the claims of the creditors were published<sup>69</sup>) suggests that Pope did not rush into print. His couplets on the Corporation directors were based on well-founded evidence and, if anything, he showed judicious restraint and accuracy in his poetic reflections.

When Warburton, in his letter, tells Pope '[Sutton's]

<sup>69</sup> See House of Commons Sessional Papers, XIV, Charitable Corporation, 1732-1734. The first report, published by R. Williamson and printed by W. Bowyer, is dated 1 June 1732.



virtue and integrity have since been fully manifested',<sup>70</sup> he is evidently referring to the 'Bill to be relieved against committee-men for breach of trust' brought before the King's Bench on 13 August 1742.<sup>71</sup> Lord Chancellor Hardwicke (the father of Warburton's friend, Charles Yorke) re-examined the case of 'The Charitable Corporation against Sir Robert Sutton and About Fifty Others', tracing the enormity of the fraud back to two main sources: that the stock of the Corporation which, by its charter, was not to exceed £30,000 had gradually been enlarged to £600,000 by 1730; and that the surveyor, whose responsibility was to examine all pledges daily, was dismissed without replacement in 1726 which removed all checks on the warehouse-keeper, John Thomson, who in effect became his own borrower and lender. Gross negligence, being a more difficult crime to assess than fraud, was more difficult to pass judgement upon. The fact that Sutton chaired the meeting at which Thomson was appointed and corresponded with him while abroad about purchasing shares may have been circumstantial. But frequent absence from Corporation affairs was regarded by Lord Hardwicke as no excuse for what had transpired:

<sup>70</sup>Corr. IV, 493.

<sup>71</sup>The English Reports, vol. LXXXVIII, King's Bench Division, XVII, 9 Modern 350 (London, 1908), pp. 500-05.

In the present case one thing is clear, that Sir Archibald Grant, Robinson, Thompson, Burrows, and Squire, who were the five engaged in that confederacy, are certainly liable to make good the losses which the corporation have sustained in the first place, and the committee-men who were not partners in this<sup>72</sup> affair are liable in the second place only.

Thus, while Sutton was cleared of fraud and embezzlement, he was liable for his negligence. Warburton's statements, both in his letter to Pope and in his footnote to the textual change in the Epistle to Bathurst in 1751, are rhetorical half-truths: 'the most unerring investigator of Truth and Falsehood' found Sutton innocent on one account, but guilty on another. Warburton transforms Sutton's £20,000 penalty into an unjust suffering.

Why then did Pope agree to Warburton's implicit request that the lines on Sutton be altered? Having recently declared in his will that Warburton would be his posthumous editor, Pope may have wanted to avoid any unpleasant repercussions. They had already had one major falling-out at Prior Park, and Pope (perhaps guiltily) had made amends by restoring his friendship with Warburton and Allen. The amicable collaboration between poet and editor on 'the Great Edition of my things with your Notes' (and in his choice of capitalization Pope's deference shows) was fore-

<sup>72</sup>The English Reports, vol. XXVI, Chancery VI, Containing Atkyns, vols I-III (London, 1903), p. 645.

most in Pope's mind. The imminence of death - and given Pope's frail constitution his 'Dying Christian' vision may have been particularly vivid in his mind - must have fostered a wish to have his oeuvre tended by the most capable and appreciative of editors. No poet before Pope had perhaps been so fastidiously involved with the preparation and publication of his works within his own lifetime; and the planning of the final form his works were to take was the overriding concern of his last years. Whatever the reasons and consequences of his decision in selecting an editor, Pope entrusted Warburton with his posthumous works, earnings and reputation.

Pope's willingness to remove the name of Warburton's former patron from his text is a curious, but telling, aspect of the relationship between the poet and his editor. He may have regarded the concession as a minor irritation; or he may have been persuaded by Warburton's case; or he may have been impressed by Warburton's enduring dedication to his patron - a quality Pope may have hoped would be transferred to himself. Not acceding to Warburton's implicit request might, in Pope's mind, have fuelled another major disagreement, and this Pope evidently wished to avoid. The thought of cultivating a new editor may have occurred to Pope only to be discounted by the unlikelihood of his surviving the breaking-in period. Having admitted Warburton to his social circle, his publishing schemes, his private

correspondence, Pope stuck by his decision to have Warburton as his posthumous editor. The intricacies of the relationship between Pope and Warburton as author and editor are unique in English literature. Various historical circumstances and personalities of genius in contention conspired to make the posthumous works of Pope the focus for controversy that it was. The reaction to the Warburton edition is the subject of a following chapter. For our present purposes, it is sufficient to note Pope's willingness to alter his text and the editorial imposition of Warburton's subtext in the 1751 Works. With regard to Sutton (or rather, 'S\*\*n'), special licence was granted for the alteration of a proper noun (at once veiling and revealing a specific person) to a non-specific referent which detracts from more than it assists the poet's satiric meaning. Why Pope allowed the change or whether he would left the original text intact if he had chosen a different editor is ultimately an unsatisfying matter for speculation, but underlying this problem is the larger concern of personality and textual transmission. Should a modern editor unquestioningly accept a textual change granted by the author, but only at the importuning request of his contemporary editor upon whom he is (or may be) psychologically dependent for posthumous fame? To Pope, it was sufficient that Warburton had shown 'favour'.

### Efficacies of Author & Editor

Pope and Warburton need to be regarded within the shifting contexts of patronage, poetic identity and the book trade. Beginning on a note of gratitude, Pope's correspondence with Warburton soon establishes a tone of business and cordiality. 'The two men were at once so transparently aware of their serviceable potentialities to each other that the association - one hesitates to call it a friendship - became permanent.'<sup>73</sup> Whatever the precise nature of Pope's relationship with Warburton was, their 'association' was one of mutual benefit, esteem and dependence.

Pope's satiric spirit becomes increasingly introspective with age. From 1733 to 1738 he undergoes self-analysis in Satire II i and Dialogue II. The 1733 poem begins haltingly, the poet seeking advice from his adversarius:

There are (I scarce can think it, but am told)  
There are to whom my Satire seems too bold,  
Scarce to wise Peter complaisant enough,  
And something said of Chartres much too rough.

Although the satirist effects his own cure through a process of vocalized opposition, momentarily winning the approbation of his legal counsellor and friend, the end-

<sup>73</sup> Sherburn, Corr. IV, 214.

result of the 1738 poem is not so satisfying:

Fr. Alas! alas! pray end what you began,  
And write next winter more Essays on Man.

Published in July 1738, Pope's Epilogue to the Satires takes on an added ironic significance, given the controversy (possibly anticipated here) over the Essay on Man critiques which will be published by Cave and Curll 'next winter'. The above couplet underscores the tugging impulses of Pope's - if I may be forgiven the term - poetic psyche: one part pulling him towards the philosophic unity of the Opus Magnum scheme, another part compelling him towards the diversity of satire (which will ultimately manifest itself in the revised version of The Dunciad).

If, as has been suggested by David Foxon,<sup>74</sup> Pope sustained a loss of poetic nerve in the mid-1730s, his confidence may have been further weakened by the publication of the Crousaz translations at the end of 1738. Having initially prided himself in successfully outwitting his critics through the machinations of anonymous publication, and subsequently acknowledging his authorship once the consensus of high opinion was certain, Pope did not foresee the sustained barrage of criticism from abroad. Possibly

<sup>74</sup>Private correspondence (19 May 1980).



he felt disappointment at not being able to fulfil his 'general Map of MAN' ideal; perhaps he thought he had said all he had to say. The suggestion that he go off and pen a few 'more Essays on Man' carries with it a melancholy note of self-satire. The 1751 edition offers one explanation of Pope's disillusionment:

VER. ult.] This was the last poem of the kind printed by our author, with a resolution to publish no more; but to enter thus, in the most plain and solemn manner he could, a sort of PROTEST against that insuperable corruption and depravity of manners, which he had been so unhappy as to live to see. Could he have hoped to have amended any, he had continued those attacks; but bad men were grown so shameless and so powerful, that Ridicule was become as unsafe as it was ineffectual. The Poem raised him, as he knew it would, some enemies; but he had reason to be satisfied with the approbation of good men, and the testimony of his own conscience. P.<sup>75</sup>

The inspiration for Pope's last assault on the world - the devastating testament of the 1743 Dunciad - was to come from a wholly unexpected source.

A brief look over the first Warburtonian words Pope was likely to have read might be in order:

<sup>75</sup>Works IV (1751), 338n. Although this note is given as Pope's, phrases like 'insuperable corruption' and 'depravity of manners' suggest that it may have been 'edited' somewhat by Warburton.

As it appears to me from the Extract [i.e. the Crousaz critique printed in Bibliothèque Raisonnée, Tom XXI, part primo], that the Examiner's Accusation of our admirable Poet is very unjust, and his Interpretation of the obnoxious Passages very impertinent, I thought so much due to Truth, and to the Honour of our great Country-man, as to attempt his Vindication.<sup>76</sup>

Thus proceeded the article which was ultimately to bring Pope and Warburton together. It may have come as a surprise to some of Warburton's former Shakespearean colleagues like Matthew Concanen and Lewis Theobald (whom Warburton had assisted with his notes and who, of course, had inspired The Dunciad), but the anonymous defence was eagerly welcomed by the 'great Country-man' concerned. Warburton applied his rhetoric in all the right places, arguing that An Essay on Man had nothing whatsoever to do with 'prae-established Harmony' or fatalism.

What then does common Sense teach us to understand by whatever is right? Did the Poet mean right with Regard to Man, or right with Regard to God? Right with Regard to itself, or right with Regard to its ultimate Tendency? Surely with Regard to God. For he tells us, his Design is to vindicate the Ways of God to Man. Surely with Regard to its ultimate Tendency: For he tells us again, that partial Evil is universal Good. Yet Mr. De Crousaz preposterously takes it the other way; and so

<sup>76</sup>The History of the Works of the Learned, vol. II, Article 47 (December 1738), 425.

perversely interpreted, it is no Wonder that he, and his Friends, should find the Poem full of Contradictions.<sup>77</sup>

Warburton summed up his article with full Anglican flourishes: 'WHATEVER IS, IS RIGHT, WITH REGARD TO THE DISPOSITION OF GOD, AND TO ITS ULTIMATE TENDENCY'.

Pope's gratitude to Warburton for his continued vindication seemed to know no bounds: he placed his critic's perceptions high above his own. Pope especially praised Warburton's third letter in the February 1739 number of The History of the Works of the Learned:

which is so extremely clear, short, & full, that I think Mr Crousaz ought never to have another answerer, & deserved not so good an one. I can only say you do him too much honour, and me too much Right, so odd as the expression seems, for You have made my System as clear as I ought to have done & could not. It is indeed the Same System as mine, but illustrated with a Ray of your own, as they say our Natural Body is the same still, when it is Glorified. I am sure I like it better than I did before, & so will every man else. I know I meant just what you explain, but I did not explain my own meaning so well as you: You understand me as well as I do myself, but you express me better than I could express myself.<sup>78</sup>

Such remarks coming from Pope to an unknown critic are

<sup>77</sup> The History of the Works of the Learned, vol. II, 427.

<sup>78</sup> Corr. IV, 171-72 (11 April [1739]).

somewhat astounding. Is it a subtle matter of emphasis; or did Pope really mean to place Warburton on such a high plateau? Misread, this letter might seem tinged with desperation or hero-worship. He has found his ideal critic and is worried lest he vanish. It is the sort of letter Warburton could produce at a later date as evidence of Pope's every confidence. The message implicit in 'It is indeed the Same System as mine, but illustrated with a Ray of your own' was, in fact, pictorially translated into the 1751 frontispiece which shows Warburton more 'Glorified' than Pope.<sup>79</sup>

An ulterior motive for this high-flown praise might be read in the post-scriptum: Pope wants Warburton's permission to collect his letters into a book so he can 'procure a Translation of part at least of them into French'. Two steps ahead of Warburton, Pope not only wants his Vindication published in a more lasting form in Britain, he also wants de Silhouette to relay the message to Crousaz! Between the lines of both complimentary correspondences is a remarkable degree of enterprise. Warburton's willingness to play an active role in Pope's canny manoeuvres in publishing might prove to be a deciding factor in the later question of editorship.

Sherburn notes that Pope's ~~haste~~ in writing this letter of 11 April [1739] was due to the imminent departure of

<sup>79</sup>A discussion of the 1751 frontispiece follows in chapter IV below.

Bolingbroke to France. 'If', Sherburn speculates, '[Bolingbroke] had had time to persuade Pope to disregard the defence, literary history would have been modified.'<sup>80</sup> Bolingbroke's preleptic absence may have had something to do with Pope's enthusiastic response to Warburton's vindication. With one mentor leaving, Pope seems to be cultivating another. Pope's later intention of introducing the defender of An Essay on Man to its dedicatee represents one of his least successful efforts. Warburton and Bolingbroke would reach new heights of animosity, one threatening to malign the other in a forthcoming biography of the poet (which would never appear under Warburton's name), the other retaliating by exposing Pope's deceit over the publication of the Idea of a Patriot King. Two more opposed personalities could not have been chosen to share literary legacies from the same poet.

. . . .

Pope's health may have been especially precarious over the 1738-39 winter, although it didn't stop him from greeting the New Year. On 9 January he wrote hurriedly to Allen: 'It is in much dissipation and Company that I snatch a few moments'. Later on in the month William Kent told his

<sup>80</sup>Corr. IV, 171, n. 5.

patron, the Earl of Burlington, that Pope 'last night came to me about eight a clock in liquor & would have More wine'.<sup>81</sup> By March he was reminiscing about 'Disorders of the stomach' with Fortescue; to Swift he sent a wistful catalogue of complaints - the last being the sea-sickness which prevents him from voyaging to Ireland - in mid-May.<sup>82</sup> Warburton was no exception:

The Dissipation in which I am obliged to live, thro many degrees of Civil Obligation, which ought not to rob a man of himself who passes for an Independent one, and yet make me every body's Servant more than my own: This Sir is the occasion of my Silence to you, to whom I really have more Obligation than to almost any man.<sup>83</sup>

The Horatian mode of urbane apology seems slightly inappropriate in a letter from a famous poet to an unknown Newark clergyman, considering that the two men have yet to meet, but it indicates Pope's candid attempt to elevate Warburton as a worthy correspondent. 'Dissipation' may seem a bit misplaced in the presence of a clergyman, but without Warburton's letters to Pope it is difficult to gauge the pattern of falling into a casual tone. This is Pope's third letter to Warburton; by now stiff formality might be dropped, and collars loosened.

<sup>81</sup>Corr. IV, 162.

<sup>82</sup>Corr. IV, 179-80.

<sup>83</sup>Corr. IV, 182 (26 May 1739). [N.B. As all further references in this chapter will be to the fourth volume of Sherburn's Correspondence, page numbers will be given in the text.]



Having introduced himself casually, Pope now proceeds with business:

As to any Corrections of your Letters, I could make none, but what resulted from inverting the Order of them, & those Expressions relating to myself which I thought exaggerated: 'It was truly from this, not a pretended, Modesty, & from a Respect to your own Character; because I think Any Character truly Respectable, (& above all that of a Clergyman) is lessen'd by the least appearance of too great Complaisance. Therefore I request seriously that you would leave them out.'

I could not find a word to alter in your last Letter, which I return'd immediately to the Bookseller. 'He has not yet sent it me in Print, nor have I heard of him in relation to the Edition of the Whole of which I desird to see & revise the sheets, to prevent any Errors that might escape Him if printed at this distance from You. But if they are sent to your own hands, I am content.'

 (182)

Two things are worth noting about the above passage. The first is the way in which Warburton 'edited' it for the 1751 Works. Sherburn's half-brackets reveal either what Warburton did not wish his contemporary readers to know (e.g. that he 'flattered' too much) or what he thought was unnecessary to print. Omissions of text or entire letters were his decision. As recipient (and editor) of the letter Warburton was free to do as he wished. The second point concerns Pope's editorial involvement with the publication of his own Vindication. He not only assumes the full duties

as an agent for Warburton (who is in Newark) - proof-reading the manuscript, delivering it to the bookseller, revising the proofs - he also wants to curb Warburton's more fulsome remarks without discouraging him from contributing elsewhere. Still, Pope tempers his part by offering to send the sheets up to Newark (which could considerably delay the publication date).

Pope's letter raises the issue of editorial ethics. Ought an author to be so involved with the publication of his own vindication as to see its sheets through the press? An author's pre-occupation with his public image is understandable, but how objective can this sort of defence be? Warburton evidently wanted his 1751 readers to know that Pope had seen the manuscript before going to press and that he thought there was the odd 'exaggerated' expression, but the omitted passages suggest that Warburton wanted to play down the extent of Pope's activities in the actual production as well as his serious 'request' for moderation.

Pope closes this sensitive letter by thanking Warburton for 'the mention you have made of me in your Postscript to the Last Edition of the Legation of Moses' (182). Warburton has quoted 'Me, let the tender office long engage' in his own Vindication of the Author of the Divine Legation (1738). Sherburn notes, 'This friendship was based on self-interest to a degree on both sides', and this is borne out by the rapidity with which both identify with each other's projects;

but Warburton's selection from the end of Arbuthnot links author and editor in another way. Both were only sons who had strong attachments with their widowed mothers. (Pope's mother had died in 1733; Warburton's mother survived until 1749.) When Pope bids his farewell, there may be more than well-wishing for that quality 'which sets a Good Priest above a Bishop'. Editing Pope might eventually lead to a consecration. It might also be a mixed blessing.

By the time Pope and Warburton finally met, the Vindication was a fait accompli and the translation was in progress. Pope had prepared for the occasion well in advance, offering to find suitable lodgings and libraries for his honoured guest's every need. About ten days before they met in the garden of Pope's neighbour, Lord Radnor, Pope couldn't have been more excited if he were about to meet - well - the Pope:

Let us meet, like Men who have been many years acquainted with each other, & whose Friendship is not to begin, but Continue. All Forms should be past, when people know each others mind so well: I flatter my self you are a Man after my own heart, who seeks Content only from within. . . . I insist on my making You the first Visit, in London, & thence after a few days, to carry you to Twickenham, for as many as you can afford me. If the Press be to take up any part of your time, the sheets may be brought you hourly thither by my Waterman, and you will have more leisure to attend to any thing of that sort in Town. I believe also I have most of the Books you can want, or can easily borrow them. I earnestly desire a Line may be left at Mr Robinsons, where, & when, I shall call upon you? which I will daily enquire for, whether I chance to be here, or in the Country (233-34).

A visiting critic could scarcely hope for a warmer reception. When the fatal moment arrived, Pope seems to have been true to his word. According to Warton, 'Dodsley was present; and was, he told me, astonished at the high compliments paid him [Warburton] by Pope as he approached him.'<sup>84</sup> Spence suggests that their first meal together went not altogether smoothly: Pope, ready to serve his guest some lobster, was told by an unadventurous Warburton, 'No, as I have never tasted it, I don't know why I should get a taste to it now.'<sup>85</sup> Still, by his own admission, Warburton was not averse to red mullet.

By the first week of May 1740 Warburton had already met the Duke of Argyle and Lord Cobham, and had been invited to dine with Lord Bathurst and George Lyttleton. Pope's initial ardour seems to have cooled somewhat. Warburton, on the other hand, was filled with 'strains of rapturous commendation' about Pope when he recounted his visit to Charles Yorke at Cambridge. Pope may even have shown Warburton the manuscript of Bolingbroke's Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism as well as the Idea of a Patriot King which he planned to have printed up. Warburton may have <sup>arched/raised</sup> ~~batted~~ the odd eye-brow at this, but all in all, his first meeting with Pope was a palpable success.

<sup>84</sup> Pope, Works, edited by Joseph Warton (1797), 9 volumes, IX, 342. Robert Dodsley, whom Pope set up as a bookseller, would be further astonished by Warburton who later refused to sell him a share in Pope's works (see Appendix A, p. 91).

<sup>85</sup> Spence, Anecdotes, I, 217 (no. 508).

Pope's next letter to Warburton - the seventh in the 1751 Works; the thirteenth in Sherburn's edition - maintains the polite yet candid style of their pre-introduction correspondence. While self-effacing about his own efforts, Pope continues to put Warburton on a pedestal. He half-mocks his own self-consciousness about letter-writing - 'Civility & Compliment generally are the Goods that letter-writers exchange' - before indulging in civility and compliment. Praising the Divine Legation, Pope humbly begs Warburton, 'Do not therefore commend my Talents but instruct me by your own', and finds himself 'at every step wanting an Instructor'. It is more than obvious that Pope intends to swell their correspondence, especially in light of the fact that Warburton has, while at Cambridge, attempted to engage a translator for a Latin Essay on Man in prose. By 27 October, Pope exclaims, 'You Understand my Work better than I do myself' (288). He commends Warburton's simile on the Bentleys which 'would make an excellent Epigram' and concludes by reflecting upon the declining state of satire. Warburton would soon be encouraging Pope to rectify this situation by revising the Dunciad.

Solidarity between author and editor was strengthened rather than diminished <sup>by</sup> ~~in~~ the Oxford episode (or 'fiasco' as Sherburn describes it). The university offered Pope an honorary degree, a D.C.L., and it was hinted that Warburton would be given a D.D. at the same ceremony. When Warburton's

degree was rejected, Pope volunteered to decline his:

I have receivd some Chagrin at the  
Delay [(for Dr King tells me it will  
 prove no more)] of your degree at Oxon.  
 As for mine, I will dye before I receive  
 one, in an Art I am ignorant of, at a  
 place where there remains any Scruple of  
 bestowing one on you, in a Science of  
 which you are so great a Master. In  
 short I will be Doctor'd with you, or  
 not at all. (357)

Such a sacrifice may have meant a great deal to Pope. Initially he welcomed the idea and travelled with Warburton to Oxford in the spring of 1741 in hope of a double ceremony. Apart from the laureateship (which Pope could never expect to get as a Roman Catholic), the honorary degree would have been the highest accolade of his career. Yet, if he wanted to retain Warburton's unmitigated confidence, he would express his protest by refusing the degree. This he did, but not without asking the Earl of Orrery to make further enquiries. When Orrery's efforts proved futile Pope, in thanking him, reflected bitterly on 'such a Demonstration of the Malignity of Dulness, which is never so rancorous as under the Robe of Learning' (440). Warburton attributed the rejection not to the university, but to the 'contrivance of two or three Particulars, the creatures of a man in power, and the slaves of their own passions and prejudices'.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>86</sup>Pope, Works (1751), IX, 343.



From this point on Pope decided to increase Warburton's editorial involvement with his works. As in the past, Pope contemplated transforming bitter frustration into satiric art. The Oxford episode seems to have acted as a catalyst. Pope was now ready to revise his Dunciad, and Warburton was, in more ways than one, to be instrumental:

If I can prevail on myself to complete the Dunciad, it will be publishd at the Same time with a General Edition of all my Verses (for Poems I will not call them) and I hope Your Friendship to me will be then as well known, as my being an Author, & go down together to Posterity; I mean to as much of posterity as poor Moderns can reach to, where the Commentator (as usual) will lend a Crutch to the weak Poet to help him to limp a little further than he could on his own Feet. We shall take our Degree together in Fame, whatever we do at the University: And I tell you once more, I will not have it, there, without you. (362)

Those who complain about Warburton's baleful influence tend to overlook the fact that Pope freely declared his intention of making Warburton his editor as early as 20 September 1741 - almost three years before his death.

Pope did everything in his power to assist his new editor: he made efforts to secure a living for Warburton nearer to London; he introduced him to Ralph Allen (whose favourite niece became Mrs Warburton after Pope's death); he encouraged Warburton to pursue his Shakespeare edition; he even recommended the services of John Knapton when War-

burton's bookseller, Fletcher Gyles, died. When Pope switched printers (from John Wright back to William Bowyer) so too did Warburton. When Gyles's executor, Mawhood, proved troublesome, Pope asked Warburton if he wanted to give him power of attorney to represent him in the event of a law-suit. And when their friendship might have ended after the Prior Park fracas, Pope cemented it with diplomatic haste. The poet and his commentator, from all the available biographical evidence, withstood a variety of strains and stresses, yet became, if anything, more closely united.

Suggestions of Pope's weakness or bad judgement where Warburton was concerned can be dismissed for the most part. His intentions of gaining Warburton's support after his unsolicited defence are clear early on in the correspondence and remain largely unaltered throughout. When he asked Warburton to undertake the job of revising his essay on Homer - 'I would willingly render it a little less defective, and the Bookseller will not allow me time to do so myself' (400) - the overworked poet was pleased with his editor's result. Pope was certainly aware of Warburton's less endearing qualities and tried on more than one occasion to curb his unctuous flattery. When the Hanmer edition was being printed at Oxford, Pope strongly urged Warburton to withhold publishing any vindictive comments and assured him that none of his Shakespearean criticism was being plagiarized.

As to Warburton's pedantry, if Pope was not fully apprised

of it, at least one of his executors spoke up:

it is manifest from your close connection  
with your new commentator you want to show  
posterity what an exquisite poet you are,  
and what a quantity of dullness you can  
carry down on your back without sinking  
under the load.<sup>87</sup>

Not surprisingly, Marchmont's polite banter on Pope's  
vanity was disregarded; yet ironically, Warburton (as we  
shall see in my next chapter) dethroned Cibber in at least  
one parody of the Dunciad. Maynard Mack has suggested that  
Pope himself nurtured the odd pedantic tendency in his time:

. . . in his younger days Pope showed signs  
of the interest in word-catching that he scorned  
in others. The earliest correspondence . . .  
show us, if we examine them with a cold eye,  
not simply the artist-as-a-young-man-of-letters  
but also the artist as a young man too close  
for comfort to the literary pedant. Even in  
the 1729 Dunciad, where, fortified with the  
bitter lessons learned from Theobald's  
Shakespeare Restored, he exorcises all his  
impulses of this sort by holding them up to  
laughter, he yet manages to find an engaging  
way of rehabilitating and reactivating them  
in the notes on notes of Martinus Scriblerus  
and the variants on variants of the textual  
apparatus. If the resulting poem is the  
greatest of all satires on the corruptions  
to which learning and the literary life are  
subject, this is partly, in my opinion, because  
the author knew some of their worst temptations  
at first hand.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>87</sup>Twickenham III ii, xvi; cited from Sir James Prior's  
Life of Malone (1860), p. 386.

<sup>88</sup>"Books and the Man": Pope's Library', Collected in  
Himself (Newark, 1982), pp. 307-21; 318. As an inveterate  
'word-catcher', I should note the altered title (cf. p. 63,  
n. 16 above).

Without knowing what the two men might have been like in private conversation, we might imagine Pope being impressed by Warburton's breadth of reading, his retentive memory, his talents in argument and his penchant for paradox. Warburton might even have risked the occasional bad joke in Pope's company. Would it have tickled Pope's sense of humour (in however perverse a way) to hear the following remark made by a clergyman: 'Orthodoxy is my doxy; heterodoxy is another man's doxy'?<sup>89</sup> In spite of Marchmont's complaint (cited above) about the Ricardus Aristarchus side of Warburton, Pope commended his editor's quickness of wit to his lordship.<sup>90</sup>

Pope's correspondence with Warburton may lack what Pat Rogers, referring to the earlier correspondence with Bathurst, describes as 'mock reproach, which is the sure sign of an Augustan intimacy',<sup>91</sup> but it nonetheless develops beyond the level of self-interest to one of mutual esteem, aspiring to 'Love and Veneration, rather than what the World calls Civility and Regard' (371). Much of it is necessarily of a business nature, theirs being a professional correspondence of sorts. This professional aspect renders Pope's more per-

<sup>89</sup>Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, 2nd edition (1953), p. 559 (Remark to Lord Sandwich. Priestley, Memoirs, I, 372).

<sup>90</sup>Spence, Anecdotes, I, 149 (no. 332).

<sup>91</sup>Pat Rogers, An Introduction to Pope (London, 1975), p. 75.

sonal expressions somewhat artificial, but an enduring affinity undoubtedly existed between the two men. Whatever emotional chemistry there may have been, its formula is beyond the discovery of the modern biographer.

As the first collaboration between a poet and his editor (at least in a book-trade capacity), their relationship is unique in the history - or hybrid - of literature and economics. Although recent research in Pope's correspondence is encouragingly ample (thanks to Sherburn's monumental efforts), virtually none of it touches on his 'letters to the editor'.<sup>92</sup> The main reason for this is Warburton's late entrance into Pope's sphere, well after the notorious publication of the Letters. Sherburn uncovers thirty-three 'new' letters, many of them quickly scribbled notes, but nonetheless well worth recording; his list allows us easily 'to reconstitute a single correspondence'. Deference in his introduction must be weighed lightly - 'Although this present edition increases by about one-third the number of letters printed by Elwin and Courthope, it may frankly be confessed that in certain cases the additions are unimportant' - since his chronological order allows us to see 'Pope moving among

<sup>92</sup>In spite of Pope's oft expressed esteem for his editor, there is not a single reference to Warburton in the index to James Anderson Winn's A Window in the Bosom: the letters of Alexander Pope (Hamden, Conn., 1977). Nor does Rosemary Cowler mention Warburton in her 'Shadow and Substance: a discussion of Pope's correspondence' in The Familiar Letter, edited by H. Anderson, P.B. Daghljan and Irvin Ehrenpreis (Lawrence, Kansas, 1966), pp. 34-48. Likewise, Martin Seymour-Smith in Poets through their letters, volume I (London, 1969), pp. 206-36, which gives a very harsh account of Pope's Letters. Perhaps the forthcoming Mack biography will rectify this.

his friends and his publishers more vividly than has been possible before'.<sup>93</sup>

Some critics remain baffled over Pope's decision to name Warburton as his literary executor in his will and usually attribute it to the blindness of the great. Yet to do so is to belittle the man who rebuilt the Dunciad. Pope may not have been in sound body when he signed his will, but his mind was certainly as sharp and as fervent as ever. The business of publishing 'the Great Edition of my things with your Notes' (and in this case the use of capitals is telling) went on, even from his death-bed. Warburton's conspicuous absence - he was with the Allens - may have been due to Bolingbroke's turbulent presence. The editor's job was not to weep over the dying poet but to tend his poetic estate. This Warburton did.

Pope's last letters to Warburton ask after his editor's health, invite him to meet Bolingbroke, express his grief at not seeing Ralph Allen. Even if he were well, Pope was expressly forbidden as a Catholic to enter London at this time because of the Proclamation. Until the end he begged small favours: 'Pray receive for me ten-pds odd, of Mr Bowyer.' In pain, he still maintained a sense of profundity. 'Writing becomes difficult to me, & indeed what matter? when a few words are enough to Express all Truth, & all we know.'

<sup>93</sup>Corr. I, xxv.



To conclude: Pope's decision to name Warburton, like his 'dying of a hundred good symptoms', might have sprung from a variety of reasons, impulses or intuitions. Pope was for the duration of the correspondence grateful to Warburton for being virtually the only writer to come to his defence during the Crousaz controversy; for giving freely of his assistance at a time when Pope had more than enough work on his hands; and, most importantly, for helping him to become 'a Scribler again'. Both men were opportunists; and Warburton stepped in with the right sort of encouragement at the right time.

They obviously complemented each other: the overly modest creator and the unduly assertive critic. They had various common experiences: both loved books, read widely, conversed avidly; both dared 'to make the experiment by writing' (to cite Pope's first Preface); both were only sons with long-lived widowed mothers; neither attended university. The Oxford affair may have soured Pope's mind about employing an academic as an editor. Or perhaps Pope wanted to play the patron; Joseph Spence already had one. Given the devastating literary exit of the Dunciad, Pope's editor would have to be polemical as well as thick-skinned. As my next chapter shows, the job of tending Pope's texts was not an easy one. A legal background would be useful in the event of copyright infringements; and pedantry had its uses, especially in swelling volumes. Hale and hearty, ten years younger, Warburton had all the right prerequisites.

A SIMILE

When W——n, with all his learning,  
By reason soil'd, to slander turning,  
His conqueror bespatters,  
With scorn each graver writes then  
Lays by a while his useless pen,  
Nor meddles in such matters.

And shall he then unanswer'd go?  
The Muses gayer sons cry no.  
And with deserved Satire  
Ode, Sonnet, Epigram, and Song  
Burst forth, and drown his clamorous tongue  
In rattling peals of laughter.

So have I seen at Southwark fair  
With harmless rage a muzzel'd Bear  
Grow madder still and madder,  
Till tir'd at last he yields his breath,  
Not hunted down, but teaz'd to death  
With wheel-barrow and bladder.

[Gentleman's Magazine, XX, March 1750, 135]

### III

#### ATTACKS ON THE EDITOR

'Together with his Works,  
he hath bequeathed me  
his DUNCES.'

[Works (1751), I, xii.]

As Pope's editor, Warburton was thrust into the unenviable position of serving as a target for the printed abuses of writers known and unknown. A catalogue of the satires and critiques directed against Warburton in his capacity as Pope's editor would make a worthy supplement to Guerinot's Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope. Evans has compiled a list of 'Books and Pamphlets connected with the Warburtonian Controversies' although this concentrates on religious quarrels and omits several of the attacks we are about to witness.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Such a catalogue is beyond the scope of this thesis, although Robert M. Ryley, whose book on Warburton will be published shortly, is working on such a project. For Evans' list of attacks on Warburton, see Warburton and the Warburtonians, pp. 294-306. Not included in this appendix, for example, are Theophilus Cibber's Familiar Epistle (1753) and Wilkes' Essay on Woman (1763).

The list of Warburton's literary combatants ranges from the obscure to the infamous: two Cibbers, Colley and Theophilus; Bolingbroke and Mallet; the Spenserian John Upton; Thomas Edwards; William Dodd the macaroni parson; John Gilbert Cooper; Christopher Smart; Mark Akenside (one of the physicians to the queen); Zachary Grey; Charles Churchill and John Wilkes. One would have welcomed a feminist broadside from the bluestocking brigade or a well-peppered riposte from Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (who had another decade of life left in her after the first posthumous Pope edition), but apart from the occasional private confabulation between Elizabeth Carter and Catherine Talbot,<sup>2</sup> there is barely a murmur of viraginous satire.

Before launching into a survey of Warburton's opponents, we ought briefly to remember that although he had more than his fair share of enemies, he also had a number of worthy supporters. Ralph Allen, who offered the run of his Prior Park estate to Pope's friend (as well as the hand of his favourite niece in marriage), was one of the greatest patrons of his day; Lord Chesterfield (overlooking his neglect of Dr Johnson) offered a chaplaincy to Warburton in Ireland; William Murray, who would become a venerable Lord Chief Justice, advised Warburton on copyright problems;

<sup>2</sup> A Series of Letters between Mrs. Elizabeth Carter and Miss Catherine Talbot, from the year 1741 to 1770, edited by Montagu Pennington, 2 vols (London, 1808), I, 276-80 (letter from Miss Talbot to Mrs Carter, 16 August 1751, and its reply, 20 August 1751, mention the Warburton edition).

Fielding bade Learning, 'give me a-while that key to all thy treasures, which to thy Warburton thou hast entrusted';<sup>3</sup> and Dr Johnson, although he had some qualms about Warburton's style ('copious without selection, and forcible without neatness'), still paid the older editor ample tribute, deferentially mentioning in his conversation with George III in the library of the Queen's house in February 1767, 'he had not read much, compared with Dr. Warburton'.<sup>4</sup> And, of course, Pope's good impression of Warburton could not have been entirely without foundation.

Warburton officially entered the fray at the end of October 1743. Although Pope's name appeared nowhere on the revised Dunciad in four books, Warburton's name was given prominence on the verso of the title-page where an advertisement proclaimed:

Speedily will be publish'd, [In the same Paper, and Character, to be bound up with this,] The ESSAY on MAN, The ESSAY on CRITICISM, And the rest of the Author's ORIGINAL POEMS, With the COMMENTARIES and NOTES of W. WARBURTON, A.M.

Warburton's initials appeared at the foot of the 'Advert-

<sup>3</sup>Fielding pays this compliment, apparently unironically, in the invocation to book XIII of Tom Jones (London, 1749; reprinted [Penguin] 1981), p. 609.

<sup>4</sup>See Boswell's Life of Johnson, edited by G.B. Hill, revised by L.F. Powell, 6 vols (Oxford, 1934/50; rpt. 1964), IV, 48, n. 2; II, 36.

isement to the Reader' which briefly explains the reason for installing Cibber in place of Theobald. This plan seems to have met with Warburton's approval, although he may not have fathomed the possible consequences. Pope's intention of making Warburton's assistance known to the public is sketched out in his correspondence. On 27 November 1742 he writes, 'A Project has arisen in my head to make you in some measure the Editor of this new Edit. of the Dunc. [i.e. the four-book version] if you have no scruple of owning some of the Graver Notes' and to this purpose he has 'scratched out a sort of Avis au Lecteur which I'll send you to this effect, which if you disprove not, you'll make your own.'<sup>5</sup> Pope's working-copy of this 'Avis' (the 1743 'Advertisement to the Reader') survives bearing Warburton's initials.<sup>6</sup> Thus his query on 4 December, 'Whether the Sketch inclosed be proper for You to authorize so far, I know not: but do you consider or whether with any Initial Letters, at the End, or no?' was satisfied.<sup>7</sup> By the end of the month Warburton seems to have granted his permission, as Pope replied with relief, 'I was willing to include Our whole account

<sup>5</sup>Correspondence, IV, 427-28. 'I'll' and 'you'll' sic.

<sup>6</sup>Egerton 1950.

<sup>7</sup>Correspondence, IV, 429-30.



of the Dunciad, at least, & therfore stayd till it was finished. . . . your Notes, & your Discourse in the Name of Aristarchus, have given its Last Finishings & Ornaments'.<sup>8</sup>

By lending his initials to the 1743 Dunciad, Warburton was perhaps unknowingly rendering himself vulnerable to attack. He had already gained some reputation as the defender of the Essay on Man, but claiming editorial responsibility for the Dunciad was a very different matter. Although he might have collected some ecclesiastical kudos by converting Pope's Essay to orthodox Christianity, Warburton must have had some reservations about publicizing his involvement in the revised Dunciad. How might his superiors look upon his literary sectarianism, especially in a work which apparently referred to Thomas Sherlock, Bishop of London, as 'The plunging Prelate, and his pond'rous Grace,/With holy envy gave one Layman place.'<sup>9</sup> Warburton might well have pondered the balance between his chances of preferment and the advantages of becoming Pope's literary executor.

Whatever misgivings Warburton would have about inherit-

<sup>8</sup> Correspondence, IV, 434 (28 December 1742).

<sup>9</sup> Twickenham, V, 312-13 (Dunciad B, II, ll. 323-24). Warburton wrote a defensive footnote in 1751, reprinted by Sutherland: 'It having been invidiously insinuated that by this Title was meant a truly great Prelate. . . [Pope] called it vile and malicious'. See Sutherland's findings.

ing Pope's Dunces, he was now more or less committed to 'the dull duty of an editor' for many years to come. It was certainly an unusual role to play - an Anglican clergyman alternately defending the most philosophical poem and editing the most venomous satire of a Roman Catholic poet - and the charge of hypocrisy was on every attacker's bill of complaint.<sup>10</sup> Envy lurks behind some of raison d'être of the following mud-slinging criticism - few Grub Street hacks would turn their noses up at the chance of editing Pope's Works, given the guaranteed financial success of such a venture. If 'No man but a blockhead ever wrote, except for money', those who edited were under the same incentive.<sup>11</sup> Those satirists who wanted to cut their teeth on the biggest, yet easiest quarry in the London book world of the late 1740s and 1750s would have been directed to Warburton. Very rarely did Warburton bite back, partly because he lacked Pope's sharp satiric style and partly because he would have been on the defensive, in a difficult position to counter-attack without inviting subsequent eruptions and eruptions. Being more or less a full-time resident of Prior Park meant that he lost the advantage of spontaneous reply.

<sup>10</sup> It should be pointed out that few of Warburton's attackers concentrated on the difference in religion between the poet and his editor. Rather, most critics thought Warburton should have kept to religious matters.

<sup>11</sup> Dr Johnson's reversal of the writing-for-glory myth is recorded in Boswell's Life of Johnson, III, 19.

Silence, as was advised by at least one of Pope's friends, became the best policy, although, as we shall see, Warburton saved up a considerable measure of venom which seeped into the advertisement and annotations of the 1751 edition.<sup>12</sup> The lapse of taste sometimes displayed in the footnotes to Pope's Works has led critics to dismiss Warburton's editorial labours en masse, yet his attacks are comparatively restrained. I do not propose to vindicate Warburton's use (or abuse) of footnotes to the Pope edition as 'ordinary places of literary executions', but more attention ought to be given to the origins of the private feuds which provided part of the sub-text to Pope's poetry.<sup>13</sup>

The first attack on Warburton as Pope's editor comes, fittingly enough, from the pen of Colley Cibber. Given the announcement of Pope's alliance with Warburton in renovating the Dunciad, a comical response in a similar mode to A Letter from Mr. Cibber to Mr. Pope (1742) would be expected by all parties concerned.<sup>14</sup> Thus the last item in Guerinot's Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope

<sup>12</sup>George Lyttelton advised Warburton not to publish his planned biography of Pope without first consulting him. He hoped to avoid any controversy over 'the affair of Lord Bolingbroke's Papers'. See Appendix A (2 September 1745).

<sup>13</sup>The phrase is quoted from Lowth in the DNB article on Warburton, p. 763.

<sup>14</sup>See Guerinot, Pamphlet Attacks, pp. 288-94; 316-19. Hereafter cited as Guerinot.

offers a double-barrelled blast at poet and editor.

The<sup>1744</sup> full title of Colley Cibber's riposte is worth citing in full for its comical link-up:

Another Occasional Letter From Mr. Cibber To Mr. Pope. Wherein The New Hero's Preference to his Throne, in the Dunciad, seems not to be Accepted. And the Author of that Poem His more rightful Claim to it, is Asserted. With An Expostulatory Address to the Reverend Mr. W. W[arburto]n, Author of the new Preface, and Adviser in the curious Improvements of that Satire.<sup>15</sup>

Cibber's Another Occasional Letter, which continues the story of his rescuing Pope from a bawdy house (referred to in the 1742 Letter), appeared in January 1744. Cibber expands on the earlier letter (which gave Pope satiric grounds for the Dunciad conversion) with a description of Pope's treatment for venereal disease.<sup>16</sup>

Cibber spends a good half of his pamphlet addressing Pope's editor. Possibly he expects Pope will not survive the year and that it would be more appropriate to deal with the man who will take charge of Pope's works and posthumous reputation. The poet laureate begins his enquiry thus:

<sup>15</sup> The transcription for Cibber's title-page has been taken from Guerinot, p. 316. Also worth noting is the name of the bookseller: W. Lewis in Russel-Street, Covent Garden. Could this be the same bookseller (or heir) who published the 1711 Essay on Criticism on Russel Street?

<sup>16</sup> See Norman Ault, New Light on Pope (London, 1949), pp. 301-07; and Marjorie Nicolson and G.S. Rousseau, 'This Long Disease, My Life': Alexander Pope and the Sciences (Princeton, 1968), p. 56.

TO THE Supposed AUTHOR of the PREFACE  
to Mr. POPE's last Edition of his  
DUNCIAD, in Quarto, publish'd October  
the 29th, 1743.

SIR,

Whether you wear a Coat, or a Cassock,  
I cannot determine; for Mr. Pope, you  
know, is so apt to put his own Praises  
into the Mouth of a fictitious Author,  
that we cannot be sure who we are to  
thank for the modest Performance: But  
this, at present, I am not much concern'd  
about; for whether you, Sir, wrote this  
Preface for Him, or He for You, I am still  
to consider it, as I find it, sign'd by  
these two Initials W.W..<sup>17</sup>

Cibber, it would seem, has made some shrewd guesses or  
else some discreet enquiries into Warburton's role in  
the revisions of the Dunciad: he knows Warburton is a  
clergyman and suggests Pope 'ghost-wrote' his own preface.  
If he is wrong, Cibber makes his apologies before proceed-  
ing; if he is right, he may well drive a wedge between the  
poet and his editor.

Cibber mentions that he has never met Warburton, but  
begs 'to encourage or better Acquaintance' (21). Then  
the sarcasm begins. Presaging F.R. Leavis's response to  
a different edition of the Dunciad, 'in which the poem  
trickles thinly through a desert of apparatus',<sup>18</sup> Cibber

<sup>17</sup>Colley Cibber, Another Occasional Letter (1744), p. 20.  
Most of the remaining pages (pp. 20-56) concern Warburton.  
Further references are given in parentheses.

<sup>18</sup>F.R. Leavis, 'The Dunciad', in The Common Pursuit  
(London, 1952; rpt. 1963), pp. 88-96; p. 88.

observes the disproportionate relationship of poetry and prose (or main text and sub-text):

for though there are scarce two Verses  
(in his Dunciad at least) that upon an  
Averidge [sic], have not an hundred Lines  
in Prose to explain and praise them; yet,  
it is pretty plain they are not so clear,  
as they should be, when a Man of your  
critical Eye, is still left, in the dark  
to grope out their Meaning (21).

Yet the sarcasm is primarily intended for Pope (who wrote such obscure poetry even his editor had difficulty in understanding it). Cibber adopts a free and familiar tone, suggesting that Pope may be using the clergyman for his own purposes and that Warburton has nothing to do with their personal quarrel:

your friend Mr. Pope, perceiving your  
Inclination to set up for a Wit, has  
waggishly given you ME for a task to  
try your Good-will upon; Now really  
Sir, I cannot but say, This must have  
very childish in ONE of you! For while  
by his Advice, you run your Head into a  
Wasps-Nest, in order to kill them; will  
not that Advice be just as merry a Proof  
of his Friendship, as your following it  
will be a grave one of your Discretion?  
. . . . How could you hope, that so idle  
a Frolick, as your standing Stickler in  
a Battle, between a peevish Poet, and a  
laughing Comedian, would not soil your  
Character (24).

Cibber candidly admits his imperfections and asks his



clerical opponent to look into his own soul: 'might not one conclude, by the measure of your Charity for me, that you yourself, Sir, are not immaculate? (26)' One or two faults do not condemn the whole character. Actors may be vain and prone to over-imbibing, but so too may men of Warburton's profession:

Has not many a frail Clergyman, who has been fond of his Friend and his Bottle, Over-night, been able the next Day to give us an excellent Sermon? Don't take this for a Personal Reflection now; for to my Sorrow, I own it, I never heard you preach in my Life: But depend on it, when ever I know you design to mend the World yourself, from any Pulpit, in London, I will most penitently pay you a religious attendance. And if afterwards I should publish some occasional Notes upon your Discourse, why may it not be judg'd as proper an Employment of My Time, as the Commentaries you promise us, upon so carnal a Writer as Mr. Pope, may be of Yours? Indeed, I should stick to your Divine Legation of Moses! (26-27)

If this is tantamount to a threat, it is an idle one. The ideal situation of Cibber playing tit-for-tat with Warburton by treating his congregation to a critical review of his sermons would not be applicable in reality; that is, the poet laureate makes a much more palpable target for satirical comment than a much less known clergyman. Still, Cibber firmly suggests that Warburton has strayed too far afield from religious scholarship by allowing himself to be caught up in Pope's more mundane feuds.

The sharpest thrust Cibber delivers springs from his inside knowledge of Warburton's previous alliance with the predecessor of the Dunciad throne, Lewis Theobald. Warburton, who once might have figured in an uncomplimentary couplet in the Dunciad for lending his support to Theobald's scholarly reaction against Pope's Shakespeare edition, was now helping Pope to usurp Theobald and install Cibber. Pope would have scoured Theobald's text for a list of potential Dunces and found Warburton's name under the acknowledgements, and although the poet and his editor would have resolved the matter of Warburton's old alliance in private, neither would have welcomed Cibber's public reminder.<sup>19</sup> Warburton would have emphasised his estrangement with Theobald over the use of his notes (or mishandling of them) and sworn his literary loyalty to Pope.<sup>20</sup> This change of heart on Warburton's part, Dr Johnson rationalized perhaps a little too smoothly: 'but surely to think differently at different times of poetical merit may be easily allowed. . . .Who is there that has not found reason for changing his mind about questions of greater importance?'<sup>21</sup> Still, Cibber whips himself into a comic froth of indig-

<sup>19</sup> See Theobald's edition of Shakespeare (1733), 7 vols, I, lxvi, for Warburton's credit; he subscribed for two sets.

<sup>20</sup> For an account of Warburton's connection and falling-out with Theobald, see Richard Foster Jones, Lewis Theobald: his contribution to English scholarship with some unpublished letters (New York, 1919; rpt 1966), pp. 182-84; 200-04; passim.

<sup>21</sup> Samuel Johnson, 'Life of Pope', in Lives of the English Poets, edited by G. Birkbeck Hill, 3 vols (Oxford, 1905), III, 82-272; 167.

nation over Warburton's volte-face:

No one sure that knows how a Clergyman ought to employ his Time, will wonder I should be a little surpris'd, though not totally displeas'd, to hear, that the very Person, who had so judiciously assisted Mr. Tibbald in his Edition of Shakespear (wherein the idle Guesses and Errors of Mr. Pope, in the same Undertaking, are so justly exposed and refuted) should now, almost in the same Breath, blow Hot and Cold, and enter into so unexpected an Alliance with Mr. Pope, whose Labours he had so unluckily disgrac'd! But great Wits, I find, like other Troublers of the World's Repose, are Friends or Enemies just as their varying Interests or Passions incline them. Now, though I cannot determine which Motive might more induce you to a peace with him, your Willingness to redeem your old Ally, Mr. Tibbald, from his Dishonour in the Dunciad, or the Regret you felt for the Shame you had inadvertently brought Mr. Pope to as an Editor: Yet this I find to be certain, that your happy Recommendation of the Laureat to be hang'd up in Tibbald his place [sic] has completed the Work, and brought every Man out of his Difficulty: No Comedy ever concluded with so intire Satisfaction on all sides! Pope pardons you! You forgive Pope! Tibbald is releas'd! and Colley the Coxcomb is the only ridiculous Person to the End of the Piece! and now—strike up Musick! play the Dunciad! and let the Laureat pay the Piper!—so three Huzzas, and King Colley for ever! (27-29)

Cibber's application of the real-life irony to the comic stage proves marvellously reductive. He not only cunningly avoids Pope's stronger motives for attacking him (the laureateship; the 1742 Letter), but he also suggests that Warburton might have insinuated himself into Pope's favour in order to free Theobald from the ignominious position in the Dunciad.

It may be a fallacious argument, but it makes for good theatrical prose. Unfortunately (at least for the sake of his attack), Cibber was unaware of Warburton's letter to Concanen on 2 January 1727 in which he stated, 'Dryden borrowed for want of leisure and Pope for want of genius'.<sup>22</sup> This comment - had Cibber been able to exploit it - might have sparked a reaction more stunning than the not-so-spectacular revelation of Warburton's former acquaintance with Theobald. Public disclosure of Warburton's once cynical regard for Pope's verse, given the added fuelling of Cibber's comic exaggeration, might have caused a permanent breach between the poet and his editor.

Still, Another Occasional Letter amply demonstrates Cibber's zeal for polemics as well as his greater worthiness (compared to Theobald) as a satiric adversary to Pope. His debating tactics are simple, but effective: while the reader is distracted by the surface (his noises, flourishes and rhetorical gestures), he subtly shifts the argument below (from Cibber vs. Pope and Warburton to Pope vs. Warburton). Never one to miss a satiric trick, Cibber plays Pope's text against Warburton:

Pray Sir, be so good, when your Commentaries upon his Works come out, as to let us into the true and harmless Meaning of the following Line, in his Dunciad. B. 2. v. 352.

Dulness is sacred in a sound Divine. (33)

<sup>22</sup> DNB, Warburton, p. 759.

Warburton obviously would not comment on this in the 1749/50 octavo Dunciad or the 1751 Works. Nor would he alter his note for line 355 which upset some of Warburton's colleagues and which Cibber ridiculed, pointing out that the factious clergymen - 'a sable army' - can hardly 'be understood in the confined sense' which the editor defensively wishes.

Pope forewarned Warburton of Another Occasional Letter as well as possible repercussions from the clergy. His letter of 12 January 1744 (a week before Cibber's attack was advertised) expresses some concern on Warburton's behalf, yet advises him to refrain from replying to Cibber:

I am told, the Laureate is going to publish a very abusive pamphlet: that is all I can desire; it is enough if it be abusive, & if it be his. He threatens You; but I think you will not fear, or love, him so much as to answer him, tho you have answerd one or two as dull. He will be more to me than a dose of Hartshorn; and as a Stink revives one who has been oppressd with Perfumes, his Railing will cure me of a Course of Flatteries.

I am much more concernd to hear, that some of your clergy are offended at a Verse or two of mine, because I have a respect for your Clergy (tho the Verses are harder upon ours) But if they do not blame You for defending those verses, I will wrap myself up in the<sup>23</sup> Layman's Cloak, & sleep under Your Shield.

Warburton seems to have maintained silence; the Dunciad

<sup>23</sup>Correspondence, IV, 491-92.



said enough. Cibber's last letter came too late to alienate Pope and Warburton. The latter must have felt relieved that Cibber's investigation into his background did not uncover anything more damning in Pope's eyes. After the Prior Park episode, Another Occasional Letter posed the most substantial threat to Warburton's editorship; yet Cibber's intimations of 'hypocritical inconstancy' (to use Dr Johnson's phrase) did not have their divisive effect. Pope's will remained unchanged.

. . . . .

Various satirical advertisements appeared in the press from the early stages of Pope's elevation of Warburton's career. Some of these appeared in connection with newspaper announcements of Orator Henley's meetings. Thanks to the clippings kept by Daniel Lysons in his Collectanea,<sup>24</sup> we can summarize the more ephemeral mentions of Pope and Warburton without having to pore over countless columns of eighteenth-century newsprint.<sup>24</sup>

John 'Orator' Henley (1692-1756) attended Oakham Grammar School a few years before Warburton. Unlike Warburton (who was dubbed 'the dullest of all dull scholars'),<sup>25</sup> Henley

<sup>24</sup>This scrapbook of Henley items is kept in the British Library (1889.e.6).

<sup>25</sup>DNB article on Warburton, p. 758.



excelled himself, gaining a special scholarship to Cambridge. Ordained as a minister in 1716, he entered London literary life in a scholarly manner, publishing the odd poem, letter to the Spectator and The Complete Linguist (1719-21), a primer in seven languages.<sup>26</sup> He gained his entrance into the Dunciad partly for his popularity as an eccentric preacher (who had left the church) and partly for 'associating himself with Gildon and Theobald in the preparation of Curll's edition of the Duke of Buckingham's Works'.<sup>27</sup> An ardent propagandist on his 'gilt tub', Henley had his uses in Walpole's lower echelons, as a note in the 1743 Dunciad pointed out: 'This man had an hundred pounds a year given him for the secret service of a weekly paper of unintelligible nonsense, called the Hyp-Doctor.'<sup>28</sup>

Henley had previously linked the poet and his editor in a newspaper announcement of his agenda on 4 September 1742:

Alliance of Church and State. i.e. Pope  
and Warburton; and Service for a Funeral  
Sermon on the Death of Mr. Pope's Reputation.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup>Details here taken from Chambers's Biographical Dictionary.

<sup>27</sup>Twickenham V, 444. That is, Henley, who supplied a dedicatory poem, helped to pirate Pope's edition.

<sup>28</sup>Twickenham V, 330, n. 199 (Dunciad B, III, 199n.).

<sup>29</sup>Graham Midgley, The Life of Orator Henley (Oxford, 1973), p. 174 (Lysons 113).

Not long after the revised Dunciad appeared in the shops, the Daily Advertiser ran a notice announcing 'Mr. Pope's new Diarrhoea'. On the last day of 1743, the same newspaper asked the probing question: 'Mr. P\* and W\*b\* married?'<sup>30</sup> When Pope's condition worsened, 'Mr. P's Extreme Unction from Mr. W-rb-n' was reported. Even after Pope's death, this irritating campaign continued: on 9 June 1744 the Daily Advertiser carried the mock obituary: 'Friend Pope's Funeral Sermon, the fifth Dunciad'.<sup>31</sup>

Henley claimed that Pope had promised to remove any references to him in the Dunciad shortly before the poet died. He also appealed to Warburton, but when the 1749 Dunciad was published without the promised changes, Henley vented his indignation in the usual way:

I envy not, that I am in my Oratory-Church-Militant, and he is in his Coach-Church-Triumphant: I wish he had known that Mr. Pope promis'd me to omit me in his next Edition, because some think ill of me without Grounds on that Score.<sup>32</sup>

Henley's efforts made no difference to Warburton. The

<sup>30</sup> The Life of Orator Henley, p. 175.

<sup>31</sup> The Life of Orator Henley, p. 185 (Lysons 127). Also not long after Pope's death on 30 May 1744 was published a ballad entitled 'Pope's Ghost' set to the tune of 'William and Margaret'. Foxon P761: 'Pope's ghost visits Colley Cibber and attacks him for his epitaph on Pope.'

<sup>32</sup> The Life of Orator Henley, p. 178 (20 April 1750; Lysons 163).

offending note was not removed in the 1751 Works. No doubt, more aggravating notices followed in the press which Warburton may or may not have read. His letters suggest that he followed the newspapers from time to time. Warburton wrote bitterly to Knapton on 3 August 1751 (not long after the Works were published), 'If one had one's choice one would wish such execrable papers as the Magazines would meddle only with their own trash.'<sup>33</sup> In a cooler frame of mind he claimed 'I have never read any of the trash wrote ag<sup>t</sup> me of several years', although he later confessed some distrust of a medicine 'because I saw it advertised in a very scoundrel newspaper'.<sup>34</sup>

Less than a month after Pope's death, a poem entitled 'Discord, or, One Thousand Seven Hundred and Forty Four. By a Great Poet lately deceased' was advertised. In the form of a dialogue between Pope and Warburton, it began with the editor's address:

W. In Meditation wrapp'd! absorb'd in Thought!  
 By what new Inspiration art thou caught,  
 Just on the Verge of Life, canst thou prolong  
 With thy departing Breath the tuneful Song?  
 Henceforth in Fables we shall Wisdom see,  
 And think the dying Swan a Type of thee.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup>Egerton 1954.f.22 (see Appendix A).

<sup>34</sup>Egerton 1954.ff.34, 45 (see Appendix A).

<sup>35</sup>Quoted from BL copy (12273.m.1/17). See Foxon D326.

As 'Discord' deals primarily with Pope's flaws (rather than Warburton's), it should be regarded as a supplement to Guerinot's list. Still, the fulsome lines given to Warburton are not too far off the mark if we compare them in tone with some of his more flattering commentaries.<sup>36</sup>

The Review of 1745 might refer to Warburton's editorial assistance in a cruder fashion:

Has Friendship not bedawb'd Pope's brilliant Page?  
Truth in his Poems had reform'd the Age.  
Too often in his Characters of Men  
Favour, or Prejudice, directs his pen.<sup>37</sup>

More direct versions of the above sentiment appeared after the publication of the 1751 Works in a collection published by Mary Cooper<sup>38</sup> under the title, Verses Occasioned by Mr. Warburton's Late Edition of Mr. Pope's Works. All anonymous, and almost always scurrilous, these verses often echo the excremental themes of the Dunciad:

To Dulness sacred POPE a Temple rear'd,  
And Warburton with notes the work besmear'd:  
So, set apart for purposes divine  
Wren's buildings rise with beauty and design,  
But Black-guard Dunces with indecent scrawls  
And filth obscene pollute the sacred walls.

<sup>36</sup> See his notes on Murray and Allen in Works IV (1751), 124, 312-14.

<sup>37</sup> Foxon R171. <sup>38</sup> She also published the 1757 Supplement to Pope's works which chastized Warburton for omitting such poems as Sober Advice and verses to Lady Mary: 'The motives for the reverend publisher of his works omitting them, are best known to himself; and which, as he has declined communicating, we suppose might arise from the following reasons...' (Preface, v-vi).

On the same page appears a variation on the 'learn'd  
lumber' theme:

As on the margin of Thames' silver flood  
Stand little, necessary piles of wood,  
So Pope's fair page appears with notes disgrac'd  
Pull down the nuisances, ye Men of Taste.<sup>39</sup>

All concur with the opinion that Warburton's commentaries  
make fit paper for other organs than the eyes. Yet another  
verse which sets Pope's poetry apart from Warburton's prose,  
relying on a juxtaposition of locations for effect, is:

CLOSE to the Grotto of the Twickenham Bard  
Too close—adjoins a Tanner's yard;  
So Verse and Prose are to each other tied,  
So Warburton and POPE allied.<sup>40</sup>

Obviously Warburton could do nothing to halt the flow of  
such schoolyard rhymes, but the abundance of them indicates  
to a certain degree the extent of Warburton's unpopularity  
as Pope's editor. He was a natural target for petty versi-  
fiers. Any objection he was likely to make in public would  
have incited even more derisive responses. As we shall see,  
even the more enlightened critics resorted to such jeering.

. . . . .

<sup>39</sup>verses Occasioned by Mr. Warburton's Late Edition of  
Mr. Pope's Works (London, 1751), p. 13 (BL: 161.m.55).

<sup>40</sup>Verses, p. 14. This epigram is quoted in a letter  
from a later Pope editor, Robert Carruthers, to George  
Bullen at the British Museum on 17 January 1857 (Edinburgh  
University Library MSS: Gen. 1790).

VER. 169. Pretty! in amber to observe  
 the forms, &c.] Our Poet had the full  
 pleasure of this amusement soon after  
 the publication of his Shakespear. Nor  
 has his Friend been less entertained  
 since the appearance of his edition of  
 the same poet. The liquid Amber of whose  
 Wit has lately licked up, and enrolled  
 such a quantity of these Insects, and of  
 tribes so grotesque and various, as would  
 have puzzled Reaumur to give names to.  
 Two or three of them it may not be amiss  
 to preserve and keep alive. Such as the  
 Rev. Mr. J. Upton, Thomas Edwards, Esq.  
 and, to make up the Triumvirate, their  
 learned Coadjutor, that very respectable  
 personage, Mr. THEOPHILUS CIBBER.<sup>41</sup>

In order to understand how these three particular names  
 came to be printed in the footnotes to the 1751 edition  
 of Pope's Works, we have to go back five years. Before  
 embarking on a brief history of Warburton's 'Triumvirate' -  
 Upton, Edwards and Cibber - it should be pointed out that  
 Pope had nothing to do with these quarrels directly, al-  
 though he undoubtedly aroused the wit of the last named:

Ye Gods! shall Cibber's Son, without rebuke  
 Swear like a Lord? or a Rich out-whore a Duke?<sup>42</sup>

Pope counted on the sins of the father being passed on to  
 the son as early as the 1728 Dunciad:

<sup>41</sup>Pope, Works (1751), IV, 23 (Arbuthnot, l. 169n.).

<sup>42</sup>Twickenham IV, 306 (Dialogue I, ll. 115-16).



With all thy Father's virtues blest, be born!  
And a new C——r shall the Stage adorn.<sup>43</sup>

Thus Cibber files would have been predisposed to attack Pope's editor.

John Upton (1707-60) became the first member of the 'Triumvirate' when his Critical Observations on Shakespeare came out in 1746. Upton's main concern in writing his Critical Observations was not to attack editors of Shakespeare, but to set a standard of editing in a well-reasoned manner. He starts off by comparing Bentley's heavily emended edition of Paradise Lost (1732) with contemporary editions of Shakespeare. With Bentley, 'there are some errors which he has undoubtedly mended', but 'In most of the other places, if he cannot find errors, he will make them.'<sup>44</sup> With Shakespeare:

the editors have proposed many better readings, which they should have mention'd only in their notes; and they would thus have deserved that praise for their ingenuity, which they seem to forfeit, by going out of their province to correct the author, when they should only have corrected the faulty copy.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup>Twickenham V, 161 (Dunciad A, III, ll. 133-34, 1728a-f). Cibber's name was given in full in the 1729 Variorum edition.

<sup>44</sup>Critical Observations on Shakespeare, first edition (London, 1746), p. 1. Upton matriculated from Merton College, Oxford, in 1724 and became a fellow at Exeter College in 1728. He was admitted as prebendary of Rochester in 1737 (DNB).

<sup>45</sup>Critical Observations, pp. 1-2.

Mid-way between editing Arrian's *Epictetus*<sup>46</sup> and Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (for which he is still highly regarded), Upton sympathetically displayed some of the errors to which texts are prone (e.g. faulty editorial judgment of source material, misunderstanding of the historical context, lapses in transmission between proof-reader and printer) and offered constructive advice. In comparing various editions of Shakespeare, Upton put aside the sort of partisan nit-picking which had tainted former editions. When critical of Pope's punctuation in the 1725 edition, Upton is judicious without being harsh.<sup>47</sup> His prime concern is the text itself, not the personalities of past editors:

I have often thought, in examining the various corrections of critics, that if they had taken more care of commas and points, and had been less fond of their own whims and conceits, they might oftener have retrieved the author's words and sense.<sup>48</sup>

Greg certainly would have agreed.

When, on occasion, Upton compares Pope's edition with Theobald's over verbal decisions, the former meets with

<sup>46</sup>Upton's *Epictetus* (1739-41) would be complemented by Elizabeth Carter's translation in 1758. Upton's edition of the *Faerie Queene* was published in 1758.

<sup>47</sup>See *Critical Observations*, p. 185; 200-01.

<sup>48</sup>*Critical Observations*, p. 178.

critical approval. Pope has Othello, in his final speech, throw his pearl away 'Like the base Indian' whereas Theobald chooses 'Like the base Judian'.<sup>49</sup> Upton remarks, 'Mr. Theobald in his edition has plainly overthrown Mr. Pope's explanation and reading, but whether he has established his own may be doubted.' He points out that that there is no such word as 'Judian' in either a Shakespearean or an Augustan context.

One of Upton's concurrences with Pope which seems surprising from a twentieth-century perspective is over the phrase directly preceding 'Out, out, brief candle!' in Macbeth. Pope decided to print, 'And all our yesterdays have lighted fools/The way to study death.' He also made a note of the alternate 'dusty' reading. Theobald chose the reading to which we have become accustomed - 'The way to dusty death' - stating his reasons for rejecting 'study':

This Reading is as old as the 2d Edition in folio; but, surely, it is paying too great a Compliment to the Capacities of Fools. It would much better sort with the Character of wise Men, to study how to die from the Experience of past Times. I have restor'd the Reading of the first Folio, which Mr. Pope has thrown out of his Text.

The way to dusty Death.  
i.e. Death, which reduces us to Dust and

<sup>49</sup>Othello, V ii 348. See the note on the text in the 1958 Arden edition by M.R. Ridley.  
Critical Observations, pp. 256-57.

Ashes. . . . Or, perhaps, the Poet might have wrote;

The way to dusky Death.<sup>50</sup>

Theobald then offers four examples of Shakespeare's use of the word, 'dusky', 'i.e. dark; a Word very familiar with him'. Upton's agreement with Pope on 'The way to study death' might have irritated Warburton who, in his edition of Shakespeare (1747), decided on Theobald's alternate suggestion of 'dusky Death'. The 1747 edition was being published under the joint banner of Pope and Warburton, and Warburton may not have appreciated Upton's agreement with Pope's textual decisions which were going to be rejected.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>50</sup> William Shakespeare, Works, edited by Lewis Theobald, 7 vols (London, 1733), V, 466. Upton's reply to Theobald's rationale is: 'The first folio edition reads dusty death: i.e. death which reduces us to dust and ashes; as Mr. Theobald explains it, an espouser of this reading. It might be further strengthened from a similar expression in the psalms, xxii. 15. thou hast brought to me the dust of death: the dust of death, i.e. dusty death. I don't doubt but dusty death was Shakespeare's own reading; but 'twas his first reading; and he afterwards altered it himself into study death, which the players finding it in some other copy, gave it us in their second edition. Study then seems the authentic word.' Critical Observations, p. 55. Or might it have been an anagrammatical misprint?

<sup>51</sup> For another noteworthy eighteenth-century textual dispute, consider Hamlet's 'To be, or not to be' soliloquy. Pope's Hamlet takes arms 'against a sea of troubles' but notes that the word 'siege' would be more consistent with the 'slings and arrows' metaphor. Theobald's Hamlet struggles against 'a sea of troubles', but elaborates on Pope's idea in the footnotes. However, Warburton's Hamlet decides 'to take arms against assail of troubles' with the blunt assertion, 'Without question Shakespear wrote, ——— against ASSAIL of troubles.'

Shortly after the publication of the first edition of Critical Observations, Warburton took exception to Upton's editorial advice in the preface to his Shakespeare edition. The eight-volume 1747 octavo edition was, as its title-page boldly announced, 'The Genuine Text (collated with all the former Editions, and then corrected and emended) is here settled: Being restored from the Blunders of the first Editors, and the Interpolations of the two Last: With a Comment and Notes, Critical and Explanatory'. Of the former editors whom Warburton has assisted, he speaks scornfully:

The One was recommended to me as a poor Man; the Other as a poor Critic: and to each of them, at different times, I communicated a great number of Observations, which they managed, as they saw fit, to the Relief of their several Distresses. As to Mr. Theobald, who wanted Money, I allowed him to print what I gave for his own Advantage: and he allowed himself in the Liberty of taking one Part for his own, and sequestering another for the Benefit, as I supposed of some future Edition. But, as to the Oxford Editor [Thomas Hanmer], who wanted nothing, but what he might very well be without, the Reputation of a Critic, I could not so easily forgive him for trafficking with my Papers without my knowledge; and, when that Project fail'd, for employing a number of my Conjectures in his Edition against my express Desire not to have that Honour done unto me.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>52</sup>Shakespeare, Works, edited by William Warburton [and Alexander Pope], 8 vols (London, 1747), I, x-xi. On the list of booksellers are: J. and P. Knapton, S. Birt, T. Longman and T. Shewell, H. Lintott [sic], C. Hitch, J. Brindley, J. and R. Tonson and S. Draper, R. Wellington, E. New, and B. Dod. The edition was dedicated to Mrs Allen.

This is Warburton at his editorial worst. Pope told Warburton years before that Hanmer's edition was not worth opposing.<sup>53</sup> Warburton's private feuds have nothing to do with the objective editing of Shakespeare's plays, nor are they any concern of the reader. The inclusion of Pope's name on the title-page was a dubious ploy to increase sales of an edition not likely to meet with critical approval. There is nothing to suggest in Pope's correspondence that he would have wanted his name associated with Warburton's edition. The veiled reference to Upton in Warburton's preface must have been puzzling to many contemporary readers:

But this interval of good sense, as it may be short, is indeed but new. For I remember to have heard of a very learned Man, who, not long since, formed a design of giving a more correct Edition of Spenser; and, without doubt, would have performed it well; but he was dissuaded from his purpose by his Friends, as beneath the dignity of a Professor of the occult Sciences. Yet these very Friends, I suppose, would have thought it had added lustre to his high Station, to have new-furbished out some dull northern Chronicle, or dark Sibylline Aenigma. But let it not be thought that what is here said insinuates any thing to the discredit of Greek and Latin criticism.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Pope, Correspondence, IV, 438 (18 January[1742/3]). Warburton omitted Pope's references to Hanmer in the 1751 Works: 'I consulted Mr Murray on your Question as to writing to Sir T.H. We agreed you should not. . . '

<sup>54</sup> Shakespeare, Works, Warburton edition (1747), I, xxvi.



Edit Spenser or Epictetus, Warburton seems to warn Upton, but leave Shakespeare alone.

Upton responded ardently to Warburton's preface by adding one of his own to the second edition of Critical Observations in 1748.<sup>55</sup> Upton begins his preface by mentioning that his bookseller in London has sent word to him in the country of Warburton's abusive comments. Now that the 1747 Shakespeare is in his hands, Upton expresses his astonishment at the number of textual flaws: 'But where to begin, and when I have once begun how to leave off I know not: the faults are so many, and of so many sorts'.<sup>56</sup> But begin he does, and the preface swells to some sixty pages of criticisms. He accuses Warburton of being incapable of editing Shakespeare on the basis of his ignorance of ancient customs and manners and proceeds to attack his knowledge of languages. Upton even goes so far as to suggest Warburton has plagiarized some of his notes. In short, Warburton is a false critic, one who over-refines the text, adding long commentaries, to hide his intellectual inadequacies: 'He has launched forth on the immense ocean of criticism with not compass or card to direct his little skiff. . . yet all this fig-leave covering will but the more serve to discover the nakedness

<sup>55</sup>The main text was also substantially revised. The bookseller, G. Hawkins, had published Upton's Epictetus as well as a couple of replies to the Divine Legation.

<sup>56</sup>Critical Observations, second edition (1748), viii.

of the commentator to the discerning eye of the real Critic.'<sup>57</sup>

Of the several textual errors Upton discovers in Warburton's Shakespeare, the most culpable seems to occur in King Lear. Warburton objects to having his Fool say, 'I'll speak a prophecy OR ERE I go', maintaining that 'OR ERE' is not English. He therefore suggests in his footnote that the text should read: 'I'll speak a prophecy OR TWO ERE I go.'<sup>58</sup> Upton rightly points out the injustice which such a reading would do to the metre; he also finds two examples of 'OR ERE' elsewhere in Warburton's edition which have not been questioned. Contradictions, Upton painstakingly indicates, abound.<sup>59</sup> Warburton's editorial practice, to continue Upton's line of attack, is riddled with faulty hypotheses and inconsistencies.

The main problem with Warburton's methodology in editing is his lack of judging when to apply his scholarship and when to subdue his satire. Pope made no ungentlemanly provocations in his preface to Shakespeare, but sought to establish the objective principles of editing. Warburton allows his personal animosities to infiltrate his scholarship, as though he were editing Shakespeare and writing his

<sup>57</sup>Critical Observations (1748), xlv.

<sup>58</sup>Shakespeare, Works, Warburton ed., VI, 76-77. Kenneth Muir in the Arden Lear (1972) reads: 'I'll speak a prophecy ere I go' (p. 104; III ii 80).

<sup>59</sup>Critical Observations, xxv.

own version of the Dunciad simultaneously. From his self-assumed vantage point of editorial superiority, he even looks smugly down on Pope's contribution:

He was desirous I should give a new edition of this poet, as he thought it might . . . put a stop to the prevailing folly of altering the text of celebrated authors without talents or judgment. And he was willing that his edition should be melted down into mine, as it would, he said, afford him (so great is the modesty of an ingenuous temper) a fit opportunity of confessing his mistakes. In memory of our friendship, I have, therefore, made it our joint edition.<sup>60</sup>

As Watson has pointed out, there is no proof (and Sherburn's Correspondence bears this out) of this statement.

Adding fuel to the fire, Warburton inserted a derogatory note on Upton in the 1749 edition of the Dunciad, thereby signifying his lack of distinction in glossing his enemies from one edition to another: Warburton's Dunces could be cited in the footnotes to Pope's Works or Shakespeare's equally. Or to put it another way, critics of his Shakespeare edition might be answered in the footnotes to Pope as though the critical apparatus was interchangeable. At this stage, we begin to witness the tyrannical turn of Warburton's editorial policy. He can, without scruple, malign his opponents in editions of Pope, under pseudonyms of Scriblerus

<sup>60</sup> John Selby Watson, The Life of William Warburton (London, 1863), p. 317 [hereafter referred to as Watson].

Aristarchus, and give the erroneous impression that Pope permitted him to do so. Thus enemies which Pope never knew are subjected to malicious editorial treatment in his works:

Whereas had they followed the Example of these Microscopes of wit, Kuster, Burman, and their followers, in verbal Criticism on the learned Languages, their acuteness and industry might have raised them a name equal to the most famous of Scholiasts.<sup>61</sup> We can therefore but lament the late Apostasy of the Prebendary of Rochester, who beginning in so good a train, has now turned to write Comments on the FIRE-SIDE and DREAMS upon Shakespear; where we find the Spirit of Oldmixon, Gildon, and Dennis, all revived in his belaboured Observations. SCRIBL.

Here, Scriblerus! in this affair of the FIRE-SIDE, I want thy usual candour. It is true Mr. Upton did write notes upon it; but with all honour and good faith. He took it to be a Panegyric on his Patron. This it is to have to do with Wits; a commerce unworthy a Scholiast of so solid learning. ARIST.<sup>61</sup>

Strangely enough, Warburton cancelled the above note in the 1751 Works which referred to the couplet, 'Are things which Kuster, Burman, Wasse shall see,/When Man's whole frame is obvious to a Flea',<sup>62</sup> although there was an entry in the index which read: 'UPTON (John) a Renegado Scholiast, writes notes on the FIRE-SIDE, iv. 237.'<sup>63</sup> However, some-

<sup>61</sup>The Dunciad (1749), pp. 28-29n. (Foxon P800 [1750]).

<sup>62</sup>Twickenham, V, 366 (Dunciad IV, ll. 237-38).

<sup>63</sup>Pope, Works (1751), V (Dunciad, 'Index of Matters contained in this poem and notes'; no pagination [final page of volume]). This index reference to Upton appears again in the 1752 edition.

time after removing the 1749 note (and presumably forgetting to revise the index), Warburton decided to substitute Upton's name for that of Aristarchus in a note which had been printed under Pope's supervision in 1743.<sup>64</sup> Thus, instead of 'It would be a Problem worthy the solution of Aristarchus himself' (as Pope read it in the last edition of the Dunciad before his death), Warburton put 'It were a problem worthy the solution of that profound Scholiast, Mr. Upton himself'.<sup>65</sup> This sort of alteration poses obvious ethical problems on the nature of Warburton's editing and how he stretched the interpretation of the 'without future alterations' clause in Pope's will. As we shall see when we come to Theophilus Cibber's Familiar Epistle (1753), this infringement on editorial rationale was scrutinized.

The second member of Warburton's triumvirate, Thomas Edwards (1699-1757), comes under fire on two other occasions in the 1751 edition.<sup>66</sup> Like Upton, Edwards was used as Warburton's target in the 1749 Dunciad annotations.<sup>67</sup> His reason for being there was his attack on Warburton in Canons of Criticism which had evolved out of the anonymous Supple-

<sup>64</sup>The 1743 note, signed 'SCRIBL. W.', is printed in Twickenham V, 406, n. 624.

<sup>65</sup>Pope, Works (1751), V, p. 295 n. 624.

<sup>66</sup>Works, I, 188 (Essay on Criticism, ver. 463) and V, 288 (Dunciad IV, ver. 567).

<sup>67</sup>Book IV, ver. 567. This note was slightly revised for the 1751 edition. In both, it is signed 'SCRIBL.'

ment to Mr. Warburton's Edition of Shakespear (1748).

Signed 'By another Gentleman of Lincoln's Inn', the Canons of Criticism enumerate various errors of Warburton's editing in a satirical manner. For example:

- I. A Professed Critic has a right to declare, that his Author wrote what ever He thinks he ought to have written, with as much positiveness as if he had been at his Elbow.
- II. He has a right to alter any passage, which He does not understand.
- XIII. He need not attend to the low accuracy of orthography, or pointing; but may ridicule such criticisms in others.
- XXIII. The Professed Critic, in order to furnish his Quota to the Bookseller, may write Notes of Nothing; that is to say, Notes which either explaine things which do not want explanation, or such as do not explaine matters at all, but merely fill up so much paper.<sup>68</sup>

The last cited canon must have particularly vexed Warburton, who was preparing his notes for the 1751 edition. If Horace Walpole's estimate can be believed, Edwards' attack struck Warburton most deeply.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>68</sup> See index of Canons of Criticism. This was evidently a popular book: it went into its third edition in 1750 (not long before Warburton's Pope edition); a seventh was published in 1765. The bookseller for both these editions was C. Bathurst who became one of the Pope proprietors by 1752!

<sup>69</sup> Horace Walpole's Correspondence, edited by Wilmarth Lewis et al, 48 vols (New Haven, 1937-83), vol. 9, 116-17 (Walpole to George Montagu, 13 June 1751: 'I am told ... Warburton has cancelled above a hundred sheets, (in which he had inserted notes) since the publication of the Canons of Criticism.' This will be discussed in chapter IV.).



Edwards has been amply treated elsewhere,<sup>70</sup> but one or two connections ought to be made in the context of this chapter. The rift between Warburton and Edwards began at Prior Park when Edwards apparently challenged Warburton's knowledge of Greek. Part of their estrangement may have had something to do with Samuel Richardson. Warburton had been in the vanguard of Clarissa devotees and was asked by the author to provide some prefatory comments which were included in the first edition of volumes three and four in 1748. Richardson subsequently decided to drop Warburton's preface in the second edition of 1749 apparently on the basis of Warburton's intimation that the novelist, who was providing 'mere Amusement', had been influenced by French writers. By this time, Edwards began corresponding with Richardson, and 'relations with Warburton deteriorated markedly after Edwards was elevated to the novelist's circle.'<sup>71</sup> Warburton must have nurtured some resentment against Richardson long after he salvaged his preface, substituting the

<sup>70</sup> See Watson, pp. 241, 295, 324-35 (many of Edwards' criticisms of Warburton's editing of Shakespeare are given in this section), 347, 354, 396. Watson gives a slightly misleading impression when he describes Edwards as a 'young officer' who corrects Warburton's Greek (before audaciously suggesting Warburton took his meaning from a bad French translation): Edwards was no more than a year younger than Warburton (p. 322).

Also, Evans covers Edwards in fair detail, pp. 126, 158-62, 193. There is a brief DNB article. The introduction by Dennis G. Donovan to The Sonnets of Thomas Edwards (1765, 1780), Augustan Reprint Society, no. 164 (Los Angeles, 1974), i-xiii, gives a well-rounded account of "Warburton's Critic".

<sup>71</sup> Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson, edited and introduced by John Carroll (Oxford, 1964), p. 16.

name of Fielding for that of Clarissa's author in a long note in 1751 on England's 'foremost' novelist.<sup>72</sup> Two years later, Richardson wrote to Edwards of a rude encounter with Warburton.<sup>73</sup> Once again, Warburton has demonstrated an indiscriminate transference of critical apparatus and attitudes.

Before leaving Edwards for the third member of Warburton's triumvirate, we should point out that Edwards' criticism of Warburton extended to the sonnet form. One beginning 'TONGUE-doughty Pedant' bids Warburton to stop writing commentaries as 'Much hast thou written—more than will be read'. Another sonnet (XXXII) is directly addressed 'To the Editor of Mr. POPE's Works':

O Born in luckless hour, with every Muse  
And every Grace to foe! what wayward fate  
Drives thee with fell and unrelenting hate  
Each choicest work of Genius to abuse?

Suffic'd it not with sacrilegious views  
Great Shakespear's awful shade to violate:  
And His fair Paradise contaminate,  
Whom impious Lauder blushes to accuse.

Must Pope, thy friend, mistaken hapless bard!  
(To prove no sprig of laurel e'er can grow  
Unblasted by thy venom) must he groan,  
Now daub'd with flattery, now by censure scarr'd  
Disguis'd, deform'd, and made the public shew  
In motley weeds, and colours not his own?

<sup>72</sup>Pope, Works (1751), IV, 167 (Epistle to Augustus, l. 146n.).

<sup>73</sup>Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson, pp. 225-27 (21 April 1753).

The ideal thing for Warburton's most articulate critic would have been to edit Pope's works himself. This very suggestion was put to Edwards by Richardson, but to no avail.<sup>74</sup> When Warburton attacked Edwards in the footnotes of the 1749 Dunciad<sup>75</sup> and the 1751 Works, various other writers rallied to the aid of 'Fungoso' or (to apply Warburton's other epithet for Edwards) the 'Gentleman of the last Edition of the Dunciad', among them, Mark Akenside. His ode, 'To Thomas Edwards, Esquire: On the Late Edition of Mr. Pope's Works', contains the revealing footnote concerning Warburton's former castigation of Pope to Theobald and Concanen.<sup>76</sup> It was unfortunate that Edwards' critical talents were not put to editorial use in Pope's Works, but rather forced Warburton to become even more entrenched in malicious commentary. One anonymous Edwards' supporter did Warburton the bad office of misspelling his name:

Walburton seizd the blunted tool  
 fitter for oister-opening drab  
 For Criticks use t'was now too dull  
 But though it could not cut t'wou'd stab  
 Then Shakespear bled with every friend  
 That lov'd the bard he threatend further  
 And god knows what had been the end  
 Had not Tom Edwards called out murther  
 Affrighted out of fearful word  
 A while he hid the felon steel  
 Now shows it Mason, lends it Hurd,<sup>77</sup>  
 And see what Grey & Cowley feel!

<sup>74</sup>Evans, p. 126. <sup>75</sup>In the introduction to Edwards' Sonnets, Donovan dates Warburton's reply as 1751 (v).

<sup>76</sup>Poems of Mark Akenside (London, 1772), p. 365.

<sup>77</sup>BL: Add. MSS. 37683.f.33 (undated).

Edwards, who had previously helped Pope by sending samples of stone and metal for his grotto,<sup>78</sup> enjoyed a certain amount of celebrity as a result of his Canons, although Dr Johnson declared in Warburton's favour: 'he has given him some smart hits to be sure; but there is no proportion between the two men. . . . A fly, Sir, may sting a stately horse and make him wince; but one is but an insect, and the other is a horse still.'<sup>79</sup>

The last member of Warburton's triumvirate was the most irritating over the long run. Theophilus Cibber (1703-58) took the opportunity of satirizing Warburton's Shakespeare edition (and siding with Upton's Critical Observations) in A Serio-comic Apology which appeared late in 1748. His Apology was appended to his revamping of Romeo and Juliet. A more sustained attack on Warburton's editing of Pope, A Familiar Letter, will be discussed shortly, but we should first establish the younger Cibber's credentials as one of Warburton's Dunces in the Arbuthnot footnote. Like Upton and Edwards, Theophilus Cibber qualified for subtextual disdain in 1751 by daring to question Warburton's scholarship and knowledge of Shakespeare. Cibber's attack, although it fails to add to the previous critical evidence, makes some points about Warburton's ponderous style through

<sup>78</sup>Correspondence, IV, 342, 349, 351-52, 361 (29 April 1741-5 September [1741]). Pope mentions Edwards to Charles Bathurst who later publishes the Canons.

<sup>79</sup>Boswell's Life of Johnson, I, 263.

parody:

Such things have passed; and it is not out of our Memory, when a celebrated satyrical Poem was ushered into the World, by a military Champion (who Dymock like) threw down his Gauntlet, to challenge All who dared to gainsay the Infallibility of the great Pope—and who the Devil durst?—Nay, to the last Edition of the Work even a Reverend D—e has not declined setting his Name to an Introduction of this favourite Cub new-tick'd, tho' he seems to have but little Excuse for it, but his sudden great Friendship to the all-bepraised Poet, besides the Pleasure of abusing a Man whom he scarcely Knew if he had met him; and indeed appeared as little acquainted with, as he has since proved himself to be with the right Reading of Shakespear, or a true taste of Criticism: How far his Knowledge extends therein any one may soon learn by dipping into Mr. W-rb-rt-n's new Edition of our great Dramatic Writer; or taking a View of Mr. Upton's Observations, &c. (a Work worthy of any one's Perusal) wherein his Reverendship's Taste and Judgment, tho' but tenderly touched, may be seen in a pretty just Light.<sup>80</sup>

Shakespeare envy, then, was the main critical ailment of mid eighteenth-century editing. Pope's experience with this syndrome should have provided a lesson for Warburton who had little satiric resilience. Pope could channel a larger part of his frustration at being unable to effect an editing coup in the rage for emendation into the satiric, purgative Dunciad. The best Warburton could do was to plant the occasional name in his footnotes with the hope

<sup>80</sup> Theophilus Cibber, A Serio-comic Apology, for the part of the life of Mr. Theophilus Cibber (London, 1748), pp. 71-72. This is appended to Romeo and Juliet. Cibber's planned autobiography was thwarted, possibly by Fielding (Twickenham, V, 434).

of finding some agreeable reactions from his readership. Few rose to support Warburton's editing of either Shakespeare or Pope, at least in print. One wonders how Mrs Allen, to whom this controversial edition was dedicated, felt; but one of her guests at Prior Park may have given voice to her dilemma:

READER, it is impossible we should know what sort of person thou wilt be: for, perhaps, thou may'st be as learned in human nature as Shakespear himself was, and, perhaps, thou may'st be no wiser than some of his editors. Now lest this latter should be the case, we think proper, before we go any further together, to give thee a few wholesome admonitions; that thou may'st not as grossly misunderstand and misrepresent us, as some of the said editors have misunderstood and misrepresented their author.<sup>81</sup>

Like Pope, Warburton was fulfilling a long-term editorial ambition which, when realized, went wrong. By combining his name with Pope's on Shakespeare title-page, Warburton was not only issuing an invitation to all survivors of the Dunciad, but also advertising for a new breed of critic. It is important to establish the extent of the damage done to Warburton's prestige as an editor of Shakespeare before approaching the Pope edition.

<sup>81</sup>Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, p. 467 (Book X, Chapter i, 'Containing Instructions very necessary to be perused by modern Critics' [in italics]).



Criticisms of Warburton's edition of Shakespeare continued throughout the century. Benjamin Heath's 1765 Revisal of Shakespeare's Text, wherein the Alterations introduced into it by the more modern Editors are particularly examined re-inforced previous scathing reviews:

Mr. Warburton's pretensions are pompous and solemn, calculated to raise the highest expectations in the reader, which were never surely before so miserably defeated by the execution. . . . The licentiousness of his criticism overleaps all bounds or restraint, while the slightest glitter of a heated imagination is sufficient to mislead him into the most improbable conjectures, which are at the same time constantly enforced by the authoritative, and frequently almost oracular, manner in which they are delivered (vi-vii).

One need but glance at the index to Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare to form an impression of the staggering balance between what the later editor rejected and what he preserved.<sup>82</sup> Few modern scholars have discovered much of value in the Warburton edition of Shakespeare, and to more than a slight extent this eighteenth-century after-taste of editorial bitterness has polluted the Pope edition.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Johnson, Works, vols 7-8, edited by Arthur Sherbo (New Haven, Conn., 1968), passim.

<sup>83</sup> For the curious bibliographical history of this edition, see Giles E. Dawson, 'Warburton, Hanmer, and the 1745 Edition of Shakespeare', Studies in Bibliography, II (1949-50), 35-48; and Arthur Sherbo's follow-up, 'Warburton and the 1745 Shakespeare', Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LI (1952), 71-82. Also: R.L. Widmann, 'Compositors and Editors of Shakespeare Editions', PBSA, 67 (1973), 389-400.

Financially, the Shakespeare edition must have been an embarrassing loss. Although Warburton is listed by Nichols as having received £500 for his labours,<sup>84</sup> the edition itself (which was originally priced at £2 8s.) was remaindered within the year at 18s. On the other hand, Hanmer's edition (which Warburton liked to point out years afterwards was paid for out of the editor's own pocket: a vanity edition!) made a profit of some £556; and owners of the Oxford edition were pleased that their purchase at £3 2s. in 1744 rose to a value of £10 by 1763.<sup>85</sup> Hanmer's was a deluxe limited edition (its 584 sets were pre-sold by subscription); Warburton's was a trade edition by comparison, and the unpopularity of its editor no doubt contributed to the fact that it became hard to sell.<sup>86</sup>

It remains to be pointed out that Warburton's Triumvirate changed personnel over the years. By 1770, the Reverend Dr Zachary Grey took Upton's place in the Arbuthnot footnote. Grey earned his promotion by penning A Free and Familiar Letter to that Great Refiner of Pope and Shakespear, the Rev. Mr. William Warburton in 1750. Apart from mocking Warburton's editorial style and conjectures, he parodied the clause re-

<sup>84</sup>Literary Anecdotes, V, 597.

<sup>85</sup>For a thorough account of the Hanmer edition (including the Vice-chancellor's expenditure and receipts ledger), see Harry Carter, A History of the Oxford University Press, vol. I: to the year 1780 (Oxford, 1975), pp. 301-03.

<sup>86</sup>Andrew Millar bought 35 sets of the eight-volume Warburton Shakespeare at a rate of £1 7s. at the Knapton auction on 25 September 1755. The price had dropped a shilling from the previous auction. See Appendix D.

lating to Warburton in Pope's will: 'I leave my Friend the Reverend Mr. William Warburton, all my Manuscripts and printed Books, to write Notes upon them in the Manner he thinks fit, in order to expose him to the Sneer and Contempt of Mankind'.<sup>87</sup> Warburton, as Grey went on to elaborate:

... has the best Skill of any Man I know, in making Galimaufrys and Hotch Potches, in larding English with Bits of Latin and French, in making Slops and Sauces, (or Notes upon Books) he is furnish'd with a whole Shop full of Shreds, a small Magazine of Book Stories, a few Spanish and Italian Proverbs; he can shuttle and cut, and tho' he is a mere Bungler in Criticism, yet like the proper Indians, he excels all Mankind in every slight and Trick of Legerdemain... (pp. 29-30)

What prompted Warburton to lump Grey with Edwards and Cibber when he later came to revise the Arbuthnot footnote was probably a passage in the 1754 Critical, Historical and Explanatory Notes on Shakespeare in which Grey rekindled the old controversy by mocking Warburton's editing and begging either Edwards or Upton to repair the damage. Edward Capell (1713-81), who published his edition of Shakespeare in 1768, was cited in the 1770 Triumvirate note as a sort of fourth musketeer. When it came to critics and editors of Shakespeare, Warburton's spleen *was fit to burst*.

<sup>87</sup> [Zachary Grey] A Free and Familiar Letter (London, 1750), pp. 23-24.

One of the more innocuous satires against Warburton in the wake of Edwards' Canons of Criticism came from Christopher Smart. Written under the eccentric nom de plume of Ebenezer Pentweazle, The Horatian Canons of Friendship appeared ~~out of~~ a Cornish closet in 1750.<sup>88</sup> Smart opened with an ironic dedication 'to that admirable critic, the Rev. Mr. William Warburton', then proceeded to delineate his conversion:

Some years have elapsed since I admired you, whom I never saw, and your works, which I never read, by tradition: I thought you almost infallible, and, in all submission, kiss'd your toe with the rest of the deluded multitude. But (thanks to honest, ingenious Edwards) I am at length convinced that your Holiness is an old woman, a mere Pope Joan. . .

If Smart did in fact admire Warburton previously, his awe ~~had~~ no doubt sprung from his connection with Pope and the encouraging letter Smart received from the older poet requesting a sample Latin translation of the Essay on Man.<sup>89</sup> The exaggeration of a 'multitude' - presumably Warburton attracted some attention around Cambridge when Oxford turned down the honorary degree - seems inappropriate: Warburton was hardly a popular figure.

With the recent publication of the 1749 Dunciad, Smart

<sup>88</sup> See Foxon S493. A London bookseller, J. Newbery, appears on the imprint.

<sup>89</sup> Correspondence, IV, 483-84 (18 November [1743]).

takes the opportunity of deriding Warburton's editing of both Shakespeare and Pope, again relying on Edwards as a critical arbiter:

The other Gentleman, of Lincoln's Inn [i.e. Edwards], has shewn your picture to the publick, and the publick have acknowledged the likeness. Your Shakespeare has given us a sample of your head, as your Dunciad has of your heart. I say your Shakespeare, and your Dunciad; for neither of those excellent authors would own their works, were they alive to see what you had made of them.

Incipit esse tuum,  
Or, as Dryden expresses it,

You make the benefits of others studying  
Much like the meals of politic Jack-pudding,  
Whose dish to challenge no man has the courage  
'Tis all his own when once h'has spit i'th'porridge.  
Prologue to Albumazar (ii)

The origin of Smart's satirical grudge is not identified in his Horatian Canons. He may have been acquainted with Edwards; or Warburton might have rejected Smart's submission of an Essay on Man translation. Or he might simply have been outraged at Warburton's liberal selection of Dunces:

Your reading (it must be allow'd) has been very extensive; yet I defy you to produce, out of all your learned lumber, one instance parallel to this, viz. The making a dead man write posthumous satyr against gentlemen, whom he either did not know, or, if he did, he must have admired. (ii)

Smart makes a few feeble attempts at criticizing Warburton's

'balderdashing the English language, by introducing French words, such as Mess<sup>rs</sup> Entreme, Impuissance, and a thousand others' (iii), then changes the course of his satire by introducing a lowly tradesman who can put Warburton's papers to their best possible use, 'a man of much more worth and utility; namely, the Trunk-maker at the corner of St. Paul's Churchyard'.

Unfortunately for Smart's main argument - that Warburton had no right appointing Dunces Pope never knew - the Trunk-maker digression proves to be the most entertaining part of Horatian Canons. We tend to lose sight of the critical message in the midst of the risible: 'Mr. Critic Catchup cry'd out, Mr. Pentweazle, I beg you would not forget the Trunk-maker in the corner, a person wo whom you are likely to furnish a great deal of lining' (v-vi). Smart concocts a new mode of literary criticism on the basis of what authors' pages will line which sort of trunks:

As for your pastoral writers and epigrammatists, they (it would seem) ought only to line Trunks for little Misses, but your Epic writers, your Tragedians, and your Comedians might be a proper ornament for the Trunks of persons of Condition, and the works of the incomparable Mr. Justice Fielding might line the Trunk of an Emperor. As for the Rev. Mr. W——, Mr. R——, Dr.——, &c.&c.&c. they should line the Trunks that are intended for exportation, for they will never be read in this kingdom. (vi-vii)



The idea for the Trunk-maker may, in fact, have germinated from Smart's reading of Tom Jones (which came out within a year of Horatian Canons). When Fielding offers an explanation of Tom's initial 'Insensibility' to Sophia's beauty, he resorts to a curious analogy (more, perhaps, to admonish readers who would have Tom marry for money or lust than to reveal the nature of Tom's moral impetuosity):

This somewhat may be indeed resembled  
to the famous trunk-maker in the play-house:  
for whenever the person who is possessed of  
it doth what is right, no ravished or friendly  
spectator is so eager, or so loud in his  
applause; on the contrary, when he doth wrong,  
no critic is so apt to hiss and explode him.<sup>90</sup>

Smart's application of this stock figure (the unrefined trademan who nonetheless sways public opinion at its lowest common denominator) is shrewd but limited. Warburton will not be stung by Smart's suggestion that his pages are fit only to line trunks which are bound for exportation.

By the time he returns to the main subject of his satire, Smart seems to lose impetus. The verses he includes have little to do with his theme or his subject. The worst he can say about Warburton is that he's variable:

<sup>90</sup> Tom Jones, p. 167 (Book IV, ch. vi). To pursue the digression: 'the Trunk-maker in the Upper Gallery' furnished Addison with a model for a kind of theatre critic who stamps his 'huge Oaken Plant' to signify good or bad acting. 'He sometimes lets the Audience begin the Clap of themselves, and at the Conclusion of their Applause ratifies it with a single Thwack.' See The Spectator, edited by Donald F. Bond (Oxford, 1965), II, 413-16; p. 414 (no. 235; 29 November 1711).

Never on earth was such a various elf,  
 He every day possess'd a diff'rent self;  
 Sometimes he'd scour along the streets like wind,  
 As if some fifty bailiffs were behind;  
 At other times he'd sadly, saunt'ring crawl,  
 As tho' he led the hearse, or held the sable pall.  
 Now for promotion he was all on flame,  
 And ev'ry sentence from St. James's came  
 He'd brag how Sir John ---- met him in the Strand,  
 And how his Grace of ---- took him by the hand;  
 How the Prince saw him at the last review,  
 And ask'd who was that pretty youth in blue? (p. 3)

As Smart has already admitted he's never met Warburton before, his caricature is hard to match up with the original: Warburton may have been pompous, but it is unlikely he was ever pursued by bailiffs; he may have chivied after promotions, but at fifty he was hardly 'that pretty youth in blue'. Smart mocks his eating habits and routine of study, but nothing of any lasting value is smeared. Finally, a humanistic voice cries out on behalf of Friendship: 'And you (he cries) are perfect, I suppose'. Smart shows himself to be much too sensitive and self-effacing to be effective as an indignant critic or a resolute satirist.

A wittier, much more controlled attack was launched by a fellow Cambridge graduate. William Dodd (1729-77) claimed his authorship of A New Book of the Dunciad: occasion'd by Mr. Warburton's new edition of the Dunciad complete (1749/50) in his Thoughts in Prison shortly before his execution.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>91</sup> See Foxon D363. For recent accounts of Dodd, see Gerald Howson, The Macaroni Parson (London, 1973); and A.D. Barker, 'The early career of William Dodd', Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society (1982), VIII, ii, 217-35.

Adapting Colley Cibber's proposal of installing Pope on the Dunciad throne, Dodd set about usurping (or freeing) Cibber and replacing him with Warburton. One of the neat ironies of this concept is that Dodd effectively exploits the capabilities of Aristarchus to mock the mock-scholar. Pope had cast Warburton in this role which was all but self-parodic; now Dodd was pulling down the curtain to reveal what Pope perhaps had really intended: Warburton himself was the King of the Dunces.

Dodd came down from Cambridge - a 'Wrangler' (i.e. with a first in mathematics) in the First Tripos List<sup>92</sup> - at the same time Warburton published the 1749 Dunciad with his revised list of enemies. For a bright young graduate who wanted to enter upon the world as an author of some versatility, Warburton offered the ideal opportunity; on him Dodd could anonymously cut his satirist's teeth.<sup>93</sup> The safety of such a venture was questionable for one who might eventually want a career in the church, but as Barker points out, Dodd was lucky in his choice of booksellers:

Had his authorship of it [A New Book of the Dunciad] become generally known, the way to preferment would have been obstructed by Warburton's enmity. But for a man with literary ambitions, the acquaintance of Cave

<sup>92</sup>Gerald Howson, The Macaroni Parson, p. 19; and DNB.

<sup>93</sup>While still at Cambridge, Dodd published a satirical piece on the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease entitled Diggon Davy's Lament for the Loss of his Last Cow. The name, as Howson points out (pp. 19-20), was parodically lifted from Spenser.

and John Payne was a great asset. Payne was a member of Johnson's Ivy Lane Club and Cave, at one time or another, made use of the services of most of its members. A New Book of the Dunciad must have come up<sup>94</sup> for discussion at meetings of the Club.

Dr Johnson, who probably met Dodd not long after his satiric debut, would eventually write an impassioned plea for clemency to the King on Dodd's behalf, but it is unlikely, given Johnson's response to Edwards and his high regard for Warburton, that he would have found Dodd's jeu de spleen amusing.

Dodd chose his epigraph - 'A Man that hath read without Judgment' - from one of his potential patrons, Lord Halifax. The transposition of the introductory 'Martinus Scriblerus of the Poem' and 'Ricardus Aristarchus of the Hero' is accomplished through a 'Design' and 'Anti-Design'. The 'Design' explains why Warburton has been honoured thus:

To do honour to a person who hath done the greatest to the cause of Dulness, seemeth to be the sole design of the following Piece: The style of which is such as becometh such a work, (for of the style, courteous reader, we are necessitated to speak:) but of that made use of in the notes, we can say no more than that we doubt not, 'tis excellently well adapted to the several matters it handleth: it must needs be very various, as the things, it treateth of, are so, as well as the writers, or rather annotators, who have honour'd the poem with their remarks. (v)

<sup>94</sup> A.D. Barker, 'The early career of William Dodd', p. 222.

This parodic scholarly bombast becomes even more obscure as the voice of 'J.F. Scriblerus, jun.' rambles on, although the attack on Warburton's editing of both Pope and Shakespeare is clear enough. Dodd throws some of Warburton's more pompous phrases about 'the "unlearn'd writer"' from the Shakespeare preface back at the editor; and the opening lines of this adapted Dunciad reinforce the connection between the two editions:

Of revolutions in that state I sing,  
Where long unenvied Cibber slept a king,  
Till, by dread W-r--r--n dethron'd, he run,  
Confess'd the victor, and resign'd his crown.  
Relate, oh Goddess, whose inspiring aid  
Through Shakespear's mangled page thy hero led;  
Relate what work, each former work outdone,  
To such high honour rais'd thy darling son:  
Oh! whether gladsome prompting at his side  
Through Pope's unhappy page his pen you guide.<sup>95</sup>

After attacking Warburton's faulty knowledge of Greek, Dodd digresses on digressions in a footnote on the Divine Legation of Moses and Julian. By line 17, Dodd praises Edwards and refers the reader to his Canons of Criticism. The new Dulness sleeps on a pillow of the Divine Legation, 'Grand soporific, to compose her head', while the crowd shouts:

"Huzza, huzza, King W-rb---n's our own,  
"Be he our King, be his King Colley's throne." (11.55-56)

<sup>95</sup> [William Dodd] A New Book of the Dunciad: occasion'd by Mr. Warburton's new edition (London, 1750), pp. 1-2; ll. 1-10. This was advertised in the July issue of Gentleman's Magazine.

Dodd satirically imagines the editor would gloss the cheer thus: 'huzza, is a word expressing some mode or degree of joy. Warburton.' When Warburton's tomes are lugged on stage:

Four brawny booksellers sustain'd the freight  
And puff'd, and sweat beneath such learning's weight.  
(ll. 65-66)

('K-----' in this context is presumably Knapton.) Compounding the great emendatory problem over the added versus omitted 'e' in words like Dunceiad or Shakspear, Dodd has:

We think it should be spelt hero, without the e. We would have the learned reader observe through our work, once for all, how careful we have been to preserve the proper and original spelling. Somebody. (p. 11)

Thus, while following the spirit of the first footnote of the 1743 Dunciad, Dodd manages to make Warburton look ridiculous without attacking Pope; he even parodically reworks Warburton's words regarding Pope's desire for a collaborative Shakespeare edition: 'To put thy friend on such a grand design,/As melting down thy Shakspear into mine' (ll. 95-96).

Dodd's main charges against Warburton are impudence, pedantry, scurrility and vanity. Although he adds little to the mass of criticism we have already piled up, Dodd is the only one to attempt a parody of the Dunciad on any



remotely appropriate scale after Pope's death. For an aspiring writer, barely over twenty, it was a precocious yet well-conceived effort. Dodd was able to make the best of the moment, exploiting the topicality of the recent Dunciad edition, while encapsulating the Shakespeare controversy with wit and critical acumen. If he wanted to make an impression on the book trade, attacking Warburton was a good way of going about it. Edward Cave, who printed 'A Simile' which compared 'W———n' to 'a muzzel'd Bear' in his Gentleman's Magazine,<sup>96</sup> seems to have encouraged Dodd's talents - at least, he advertised (and took subscriptions for) Dodd's verse translations of The Hymns of Callimachus by July 1750.<sup>97</sup> Dodd's two-volume Beauties of Shakespeare first appeared on 16 March 1752.<sup>98</sup> Ironically enough, Dodd's Beauties appeared in a hybrid edition of Shakespeare's Works 'In which the Beauties observed by Pope, Warburton, and Dodd are pointed out'.<sup>99</sup> Yet another ironic (albeit retrospectively) dimension to Dodd's attack was Warburton's implication in his Advertisement to Pope's Works that his Dunces should be 'rewarded with execration and a gibbet'. In Dodd's case

<sup>96</sup> This 'Simile', which appears in GM (March 1750), XX, 135, provides the epigraph to this chapter. Cave, who did little to promote the Pope edition, may have sided with Warburton's Dunces at this time.

<sup>97</sup> Barker, p. 222. <sup>98</sup> Howson, p. 33. Dodd again applied his pen to topical events with his Elegy on the Death of Frederick Prince of Wales for which he was paid £4 (p. 21).

<sup>99</sup> There is an eight-volume set of the Pope-Warburton-Dodd Shakespeare, printed and sold by A. Donaldson in London and Edinburgh, dated 1771, in the NLS. It is dedicated to Garrick who apparently approved of the 1753 Edinburgh edition.

these words seem literally prophetic. If Warburton had known Dodd was responsible for A New Book of the Dunciad, he might have prevented him from being admitted as a tutor into the Chesterfield family, in which case he might never have forged Philip Stanhope's signature. Even anonymity might have fatal consequences for the satirist.

Dodd's Anti-Design alerts us to yet another of Warburton's opponents: 'Who knoweth not Gilbert Cooper, Esq; first used the word Design?' (vii). It is taken for granted by both Watson and Evans<sup>100</sup> that Warburton described John Gilbert Cooper's Life of Socrates as 'a late worthless and now forgotten thing' without provocation. Yet Cooper (1723-69) instigated the quarrel in his 1749 Life of Socrates by remarking disparagingly on the Divine Legation of Moses on several occasions.<sup>101</sup> Cooper even went so far as to accuse Warburton of plagiarism:

Mr. Warburton, who supposes the whole sixth Book of the Æneid to be a Description of the Eleusinian Mysteries, (which Thought, wrong as it is, by the Bye, tho' he let it pass for his own, was borrowed, or more properly stolen, from a French Romance, entitled, The Life of Sethos) gives a very cold Reason for the Invention of this Doctrine. (p. 102)

<sup>100</sup>Watson, p. 397; Evans, pp. 175-76.

<sup>101</sup>Warburton's panning review of Cooper's Life of Socrates appears in the 1751 Works, I, 151, in the Essay on Criticism commentary for l. 92. Cooper names Warburton on his 1749 title-page (after Voltaire and Rollin; and Warburton repeats these two names in his later commentary) of Life of Socrates as well as on pp. 56-59, 86-87, 102, 119-21. Cooper's Life was published by Robert Dodsley (which might explain later friction between Dodsley and Warburton).

Cooper criticizes Warburton's dedication to the Divine Legation and sneeringly suggests, 'Indeed I should not at all be surpriz'd to see in Time an elaborate prefatory Dedication, address'd to those who dare to have the Assurance to think at all, written against the Use of Reason, by those who have such Cause to quarrel with it' (59).

If he knew Robert Dodsley at this time as a contributor to the Museum (1742-47),<sup>102</sup> Cooper should have expected the sort of reply Warburton made in the Essay on Criticism commentary. Yet his response to the 1751 snub which took the form of Cursory Remarks on Mr. Warburton's New Edition of Mr. Pope's Works. Occasioned by that modern Commentator's injurious Treatment, in one of his Notes upon the Essay on Criticism, of the Author of the Life of Socrates seems to have been hastily put together and, curiously, lacks the sting of spontaneous indignation:

SIR, I should not have troubled you with the following Remarks on that indigested Heap of learned and unlearned Lumber, which Mr. Warburton has huddled together from the motley Dregs of desultory Reading, strained through the muddy Head and bitter Heart of an inveterate Controversialist, in his Notes and Commentaries, on the Works of that great poetical Ornament to our Nation Mr. POPE, as Dullness will naturally gravitate to Oblivion as its proper Center; had not this ungentleman-like Abuse of Me, and not his Reflections on a late Performance of mine [i.e. Life of Socrates], strongly called upon me to vindicate my

<sup>102</sup>See James E. Tierney, 'Museum Attributions in John Cooper's Unpublished Letters', Studies in Bibliography (1974), XXVII, 232-35. Tierney mentions in this article that he is preparing an edition of Dodsley's correspondence.

Character from the Charge of the Iniquity  
of impudent Abuse and Slander.<sup>103</sup>

Like Upton, Cooper claims that the publication date of the Pope edition has caught him unawares; he has been on a summer ramble and found it difficult to obtain a set from any of the country booksellers.

Cooper unconvincingly wishes he might have lived in 'unenvied Obscurity' and begs the reader to know he is not the only victim of Warburton's malevolence: 'Witness his unprovoked Treatment of Dr. Akinside [sic]' (4). Now that Warburton has thrust greatness upon him, Cooper renews his charges while offering tidbits of background information. He begins with Warburton's sneering Latinism:

[that] borrowed Witticism about the Camera Obscura, such miserable Spawn of wretched Malice, as nothing but the inflamed Brain of a rank Monk could conceive, or the Oyster-selling Maids near London-Bridge could utter. Upon this I wrote to him, that I thought he had used me very ill, and should take a proper Notice of him for it in Publick; and in Answer to which he tells a Friend of mine, That he was surprized I should think myself ill used, for that he never mentioned my Name or Writings in Public, or in Conversation but with Honour, till I had wrote a Book wherein I had treated him thro' the whole with a Scurrility worse than Billingsgate, and that he had now taken no other Revenge than the casual Mention of the Author of the Life of Socrates (without the mention of my Name) with a slight Joke. (5)

<sup>103</sup> John Gilbert Cooper, Cursory Remarks on Mr. Warburton's New Edition of Mr. Pope's Works (London, 1751), p. 1. The publisher is Mary Cooper; a possible relative?

Cooper next begs 'any impartial Reader, if there is the least Reflection thro' the whole Life of Socrates, or the Notes, upon Mr. W.'s Morals', conveniently forgetting his earlier accusation of plagiarism. Cursory Remarks seems to have been written more for publicity than any particular desire to set the record straight. (In this sense, Cooper's pamphlet may have had its desired result: the Life of Socrates went into a fourth edition as late as 1771.)

Once again, we are introduced to a Dunce Pope never anointed; Cooper left Cambridge in 1745. Yet for all the opportunities presented to a young ambitious critic in the 1751 Works, Cooper avails himself of little beyond the personal level. He seems more upset that Warburton neglected to publish his name in the Essay on Criticism commentary than anything else, as if to say, 'You've named Upton, Edwards and Cibber; why not me?'. He does little to correct Warburton's bad impression of his book and displays the bruises on his ego too readily. Cooper makes a couple of astute points regarding Warburton's bad taste in artistic design (more of which in the next chapter under 'The 1751 Frontispiece') and adds his name to the list of Edwards supporters, but all told his attack loses effectiveness through its lack of subtlety, its feigned tone of disingenuousness, and its all too transparent self-puffery. Cursory Remarks failed to move Warburton either to delete the offending note or to add more in the way of disdainful commentary. (As all of Warburton's

'Commentary' was dropped in the small octavo 1751 Essay on Criticism (Works, I), Cooper might have claimed a victory, but not for long, as the original snub was reprinted in the 1752 Works and it remained as part of Pope's subtext in the 1770 edition.) Knapton sent a copy of Cooper's pamphlet to Warburton who replied, 'You need not have given your selfe the trouble. . . for I have never read any of the trash wrote ag<sup>t</sup> me of several years'.<sup>104</sup> Cooper went on to make a modest reputation as the author of Letters concerning Taste (1754) and was remembered in Prior's Life of Malone as an over-excitabile sentimentalist.<sup>105</sup> He was hardly a formidable opponent of Warburton, yet the fact that Warburton chose to comment on Cooper's Life of Socrates suggests that Warburton wasn't as impervious to criticism as the above dismissal of 'trash' might lead us to believe. Warburton was certainly concerned - more than that, he was sensitive - about his editorial reputation. Cooper's presence among Warburton's Dunces confirms this; and it also confirms Warburton's lack of tact and foresight. The criticism of Cooper's Life of Socrates is, in itself, an expression of personal bias which has no bearing on Pope's text and has only a tenuous connection with the

<sup>104</sup>As Cooper dated his Cursory Remarks 30 October 1751 ('In a Letter to a Friend'), Warburton evidently read the pamphlet quickly; see Appendix A, Egerton 1954.f.34 (9 December 1751).

<sup>105</sup>See The Oxford Book of Literary Anecdotes, p. 98: 'He was the person whom, when lamenting most piteously that his son then absent might be ill or even dead, Mr. Fitzherbert so grievously disconcerted by saying, in a growling tone, "Can't you take a postchaise, and go and see him?"'



opening of Warburton's ponderous observation on 'learn'd Greece' versus modern 'Ignorance'. In effect, the situation has been manufactured: in what is ostensibly a biography of Socrates, Cooper has (perhaps with a view to boosting sales) attacked Warburton; Warburton predictably replies in his Pope edition which, in turn, gives Cooper the opportunity of criticizing Warburton's unfair treatment. None of this, of course, justifies the use of Pope's Works as a verbal battleground. But, from the trade's point of view, controversy helped sell copies.<sup>106</sup>

. . . . .

A Proclamation, which was originally published in a six-page folio by W. Webb early in 1750, was reprinted by Mary Cooper in the 1751 Verses Occasioned by Mr. Warburton's Late Edition of Mr. Pope's Works.<sup>107</sup> Described as 'a call to all wits to join against Warburton', it adds little to the Verses already discussed, although we might take note of Mary Cooper's continuing involvement with the anti-Warburton press. Webb also occupies a side-line position as one of the names in the long roster of A Pro-

<sup>106</sup> Cooper was also a friend of the Reverend John Jackson, author of The Belief of a Future Estate (1745) and A Defence of a late Pamphlet (1749), both of which were critical of Warburton's views. See R.A. Davenport's 'Life of Cooper' in The British Poets (1822), vol. 72, pp. 10-12.

<sup>107</sup> Foxon Pl103. A Proclamation was advertised in both Gentleman's Magazine and London Magazine in March 1750. Horace Walpole's copy is in the British Library (C.57.g.7/27).

clamation: 'SYK-S, GR-Y, UPT-N, W-BB, B-RT-ON, K--G,  
M-DDL--N, L--N, WR-Y, EDW--DS, A--K--DE, Parson B---N'.  
Warburton, the upstart scholar, stands accused of being  
insolent, pedantic and untrustworthy. In short, A Pro-  
clamation quickly turns into a tiresome rehashing of  
Warburton's Grub Street caricature. It lacks sting:

Fierce as ten Hockley-hole commanders  
At large the new Draw-can-sir wanders;  
Plucks all he meets with by the nose,  
And copious dirt at random throws,  
With Round-house wit, and Wapping choler,  
Disgraceful to the name of scholar. . . (pp. 3-4)

By this time Warburton jokes must have been wearing thin.

. . . . .

The last major attack leading up to the publication of the  
1751 Works had nothing, at least initially, to do with War-  
burton, but because it posed the greatest threat to Pope's  
posthumous reputation, it demanded a response from the editor.  
Unbeknownst to Warburton, Pope left a time-bomb ticking which  
took ten years to explode.

Shortly before Bolingbroke departed for France in 1738,  
Pope urged him to have the tattered manuscript of The Idea  
of a Patriot King printed. Bolingbroke granted permission  
for a very limited edition - under a dozen copies - and  
later asked Pope about the number of copies. After Pope's

death, Bolingbroke discovered - most likely from the printer John Wright - that 1500 copies had been ordered. To Bolingbroke, who had kept a tearful vigil at Pope's death-bed, their friendship now had an after-taste of treachery. The man who had dedicated An Essay on Man to him now showed himself to have been willing to profit from the death of his 'guide, philosopher, and friend'. In the event that Bolingbroke (who was a decade older than Pope) predeceased the poet, the poet could 'coldly furnish forth' the book-stalls with expedition.

Bolingbroke and Warburton prepared for a literary showdown: Warburton threatened to expose Bolingbroke in his forthcoming biography (which ultimately never appeared);<sup>108</sup> Bolingbroke released Pope's Verses Upon the Late D—ss of M- - - in February 1746 with the maligning note:

These Verses are Part of a Poem, entitled Characters of Women. It is generally said, the D—ss gave Mr. P. 1000 l. to suppress them: He took the Money, yet the World sees the Verses; but this is not the first Instance where Mr P.'s practical Virtue has fallen very short of those pompous Professions of it he makes in his Writings.<sup>109</sup>

Warburton was persuaded by George Lyttelton not to publish

<sup>108</sup> See BL: Add. MSS. 35,588.f.91 in Appendix A (p. 1).

<sup>109</sup> Cited from Twickenham III ii, 168. See Bateson's Appendix A for the background on Atossa.

anything about Bolingbroke without first consulting him. Mutual friends like Chesterfield and Murray (who could help Warburton's career) would not welcome an attack on Bolingbroke. A frosty silence set in.<sup>110</sup>

Finally in 1749 the story of Pope's duplicity was leaked to the press. The January number of the London Magazine featured an extract entitled, 'Of the Private Life of a Prince', along with a note from the anonymous contributor:

If you think proper to insert it in your Magazine, it will, no doubt, be a high entertainment to your readers, as it will give them a specimen of a work, that has been so long and so ardently expected; and it may probably induce the author<sup>111</sup> to oblige the publick with the whole.

James McLaverty makes the comparison between the printing of Pope's Letters and Bolingbroke's Patriot King; now the pattern was repeating itself. Pope had in his obsessive way revised Bolingbroke's text, and now the author was bound to publish the 'authentic' version.<sup>112</sup> Two more instalments

<sup>110</sup> If the 1747 Ethic Epistles is not a piracy, might it have been a conciliatory gesture? It unites the Essay on Man and Epistles to Several Persons, yet Warburton's name appears nowhere on it. The Atossa passage is also omitted.

<sup>111</sup> London Magazine (January 1749), p. 3 [hereafter LM].

<sup>112</sup> See J. McLaverty's 'The first printing and publication of Pope's letters', The Library, 6th series, vol. II, no. 3 (September 1980), 264-80. 'I have little doubt that Pope's behaviour in this case parallels that in the affair of Bolingbroke's Patriot King' (271-72).

appeared in the London Magazine over the next few months. By May its catalogue of books announced the publication of A Letter on the Spirit of Patriotism under the imprint of Andrew Millar (who had begun the year well with the five-page promotion for Tom Jones) at 3s. 6d. sewed. Not to be left behind, the Gentleman's Magazine published the 'Advertisement prefixed to the Genuine Edition of the Letter On the Spirit of Patriotism' and advertised three letters in defence of Pope. One of these was Spence's An Apology for the late Mr. Pope; another was Warburton's anonymous Letter to the Editor of the Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism, &c. the makings of which may be read in his letter to Knapton on 4 May 1749 (see Appendix A). The Impostor Detected came out in favour of Pope as well, dating Bolingbroke's Letter as 15 May (in which case Knapton may have been given prior warning). After fifty pages of explaining Pope's motives - blind admiration; misguided zeal - and his revisions - Bolingbroke's carelessness - this pamphlet concludes, 'leaving him [Bolingbroke] to descant at Leisure upon the Guilt of his own dark Conscience, in having been the Author of such a Heap of Slander and false Accusations.'

The controversy escalated. Once Warburton entered the fray (as he was both expected and honour-bound to do), the emphasis of attack was shifted. To the Author of a Libel, entitled, A Letter to the Editor, &c., a Webb pamphlet, began by accusing Warburton of having halitosis: 'Like those who

have a fetid Breath, you are known in the dark'! It continued in a mode reminiscent of A Proclamation:

Whether you are a wrangling Wapping Attorney, a pedantic Pretender to Criticism, an impudent paradoxical Priest, or an Animal yet stranger, an heterogenous Medley of all three (as your farraginous Stile seems to confess) there are few, I believe, would trouble themselves to determine, had you confined your Insolence to your own stercoracious Rank. (p. 1)

After that, it cannot get much worse. The author rehashes the story: Pope lied on several occasions to Bolingbroke; Warburton's statement that Pope had the edition printed shortly before his death was erroneous (rather, it had been printed years earlier when Bolingbroke was in bad health); Pope wanted to capitalize on his friend's death. McLaverty admits the plausibility of at least part of this.<sup>113</sup>

Warburton's Letter to the Editor presents as good a case as he can give under the circumstances. Pope's actions were difficult to defend by any stretch of the imagination, but Warburton applied his legal skills to the best of his ability. The main point in his favour was the exaggerated opinions of the work itself. On this score Martha Blount and Warburton

<sup>113</sup>J. McLaverty, 'A Study of John Wright and Lawton Gilliver, Alexander Pope's Printer and Bookseller', B.Litt. thesis (Pembroke College, Oxford, 1974): 'First, it seems possible that Pope hoped to make a profit from the venture' (p. 88). Bolingbroke wanted to dedicate the 1749 Patriot King to Lyttelton who declined the honour (p. 89). In his Pope's Printer, John Wright: a preliminary study (Oxford, 1977), McLaverty gives 1741 as the date of printing for Pope.



were, for once, in accord. As she told Spence at the height of the controversy, "'twas done out of his excessive esteem for the writer and his abilities'.<sup>114</sup> The paper war got out of hand, blowing everything out of proportion. Bolingbroke's hand had been forced. At seventy, he had no wish to be reminded of what he regarded as Pope's worst machination. In fact, Bolingbroke, who modified some of the more sarcastic passages in the Advertisement, came under heavier fire than Pope in the long run.<sup>115</sup> The book-burning which was thought to have taken place in Battersea in October 1744 was not the complete conflagration the embittered author had wished for; and, as Professor Dickinson concludes in his article, 'Bolingbroke: "The idea of a Patriot King"', 'Because it has been surrounded in controversy for generations, it is too often assumed that it was Bolingbroke's greatest and most influential political treatise. It was neither.'<sup>116</sup>

<sup>114</sup>Spence, Anecdotes, I, 125 (no. 284; 18 May 1749).

<sup>115</sup>H.T. Dickinson, Bolingbroke (London, 1970), pp. 292-94. Professor Dickinson has studied the original draft of the 1749 Advertisement written by an amanuensis and revised in Bolingbroke's hand (BL: Add. MSS. 4948A. ff. 449-50v). I am grateful to Professor Dickinson for his advice on the Patriot King controversy. See also Giles Barber, 'Bolingbroke, Pope and the Patriot King', The Library, 5th series, vol. 19 (1964), 67-89 [N.B. Dickinson corrects a misleading date in this article.] and Frank T. Smallwood, 'Bolingbroke vs. Alexander Pope: the publication of the Patriot King', PBSA, vol. 65 (1971), 225-41. Also Dickinson's 'Bolingbroke's Attack on Pope in 1746', Notes and Queries, new series, CCXIV (September 1969), xvi.

<sup>116</sup>History Today (January 1970), pp. 13-19; 19. For a recent thesis, see Constant Wong, 'The Poet and the Philosopher: Pope, Bolingbroke and the Essay on Man', Ph.D. (Monash University, 1983) [unseen].

In reply to Warburton's second major vindication of Pope, A Familiar Epistle to the Most Impudent Man Living aims well below the belt. Donald T. Siebert, Jr., attributes it to Bolingbroke himself, although some passages at least have a malicious ring of Scottish 'flyting' about them:

Though I should be inexcusable, for the Reasons I have given, if I answered your Libel, yet Charity may excuse me, if I give you a little Advice. I would advise you then, to keep within that low Sphere to which Nature and Fortune have confined you. Coax your young Wife, flatter her old Uncle, and besure, when any Corporation Dispute arises at Bath, to inform the heedless Public of it; to extol him ridiculously, and to rail at those whom he oppresses, or who presume to support such as are oppressed.<sup>117</sup>

The author curses the Warburton edition of Pope's Works two years before it is released:

You have signalized yourself by affecting to be the Bully of Mr. P.'s Memory, into whose Acquaintance, at the latter End of the poor Man's Life, you was introduced by your nauseous Flattery; and whose admirable Writings you are about to publish, with Commentaries worthy of Scriblerus himself; for we may judge of them beforehand, by the Specimens we have already seen of your Skill in Criticism. (pp. 12-13)

Although Warburton would not attempt something editorially

<sup>117</sup> Both A Letter to the Editor [Warburton] and A Familiar Epistle [Bolingbroke] have been introduced by Siebert for the Augustan Reprint Society, no. 192 (Los Angeles, 1978). For his identification of Bolingbroke, see pp. v-vi. See pp. 22-23 for quotation.

untoward with the text of An Essay on Man (such as omitting its dedication or reverting to Laelius), he did consider taking his revenge on Bolingbroke's secretary and future literary executor, David Mallet, in a footnote to Arbuthnot, as we shall see in the next chapter. A Familiar Epistle concludes with a mock-apology to Warburton's bookseller, although the name on the imprint of the Letter to the Editor is J. Roberts, not John Knapton:

Having reproved you with no more Acrimony, and advised you with more Charity than you deserve, it is time I should put an End to this familiar Epistle, and ask Mr. Knapton's Pardon beforehand, if it become a Pretence, which it may very probably, to get five or ten Pounds more from him for the Copy of an Answer to it. (p. 26)

Pope would have made his editor's life much simpler had he left instructions for the destruction of his clandestine edition. However great he may have thought Bolingbroke's Patriot King - he was impressed enough to pay for paper and printing of 1500 copies - the manner in which he acted defied any altruistic interpretation. It may have been a well-intended surprise that went wrong; but whatever the personal toll, the controversy helped sell a considerable number of books and pamphlets. Bowyer's ledgers record 'A very large impression of Lord Bolingbroke's "Three Letters" in 1749.<sup>118</sup> If Oscar

<sup>118</sup>Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, II, 213-14.

Wilde's dictum applies - 'There is only one thing in the world worse than being talked about, and that is not being talked about' - then Pope's reputation, more for worse than better, must have provided a lively topic of conversation in the decade after his death. A Familiar Epistle may have caused Warburton to delay the publication of Pope's Works, but the controversy does not seem to have affected the number of sets sold in any adverse way. If anything, sales were enhanced by the publicity. Still, for Warburton it must have been the most onerous part of Pope's legacy.

. . . . .

Attacks on Warburton may have been less frequent after 1751, but he nonetheless continued to attract satiric censure. Theophilus Cibber renewed his attack thus:

Mr. Pope's Works have proved a Matter of delectable Entertainment and Instruction to me. While I admired the Author, I own I felt some Indignation from the Editor's unworthy Treatment of the Poet (his Friend) and some others, every way Mr. W——'s Superiors:———And I have frequently smiled at his droll Absurdities: to give his aukward [sic] and invidious Reflexions no worse a Name.<sup>119</sup>

From Works IV (1751), he cites 'some few Instances of Mr.

<sup>119</sup> A Familiar Epistle to Mr. Warburton from Theophilus Cibber (London, 1753), v-vi. The BL copy lacks a separate title-page and is appended to The Lives and Characters of the most eminent Actors and Actresses which was ghost-written by Robert Shiels.

W—— W——'s Treatment of his DECEASED FRIEND'S  
Writings'. Cibber's list runs as such:

Ep. V (Addison) 67, 68,—72 'Statesman . . .'

Sat. II.i.12	Pope has 'omitted the most humourous part'
Sat. II.i.50	'This has neither the Justness. . .'
Sat. II.i.56	'This Thought not very exact'
Sat. II.i.63	'Inferior to the Original'
Sat. II.i.81/84	'but it is <u>hard</u> to <u>pronounce</u> with <u>Certainty</u> '
Sat. II.i.85/90	'inferior to the Elegance'
Sat. II.i.93	'Original is more Finished'; 'has a LANGUOR and REDUNDANCY'
Sat. II.i.97	'a wanton Joke'
Sat. II.i.110	'loses something'
Sat. II.ii.27	'not the Force'
Sat. II.ii.128	'Satire ill placed'
Sat. II.ii.185	'but Horace is expressed . . .'
Ep. I.i.78	'most faulty Line'
Ep. I.i.117	'Joke'; 'it hurts his moral'
Ep. I.i.118	'impair the Grace'
Ep. I.i.124	'argument suffers'
Ep. II.i.17	'not the same Grace'
Ep. II.i.129, 130	'Much inferior'
Ep. II.ii.33	'much inferior'
Ep. II.ii.37	'Greatly below'
Ep. II.ii.43	'weakened'
Ep. II.ii.51	'neither the Force <sup>nor</sup> the Justness'
Ep. II.ii.113	'not the Delicacy' <sup>119</sup>

Although Cibber simply points out Warburton's more sour and pedantic observations - in what lines Pope has failed to measure up to, or gone astray from, Horace - he at least draws attention to Warburton's overall judgmental tone and the frequency of his quibbling dissatisfactions with the

<sup>119</sup>A Familiar Epistle to Mr. Warburton from Theophilus Cibber, xc-xcix. The above list is not a direct quotation; for reasons of space, it has been condensed from the original, although the number of references (i.e. 24 of Warburton's notes) is the same number as Cibber records.

Horatian imitations. Out of all of Warburton's satirical critics, Theophilus Cibber is the only one to devote some space to an objective examination of Warburton's annotations. Most have been content to attack Warburton's personality, but few have challenged his editorial integrity. Cibber's Familiar Epistle makes itself all the more effective by reinforcing satire with textual proof. His critique may have had some effect on Warburton's decision to alter the format for the 1754 edition. In this ten-volume pot octavo Works many of Warburton's notes have been dropped and others have been shifted from the bottom of the page to the back of the volume.<sup>120</sup>

Cibber's delivery follows Smart's convoluted style, but he is much more assertive in his close discussion of the Warburton text. Like Smart, Cibber plants the occasional digression for the reader's benefit; instead of the trunk-maker, Cibber introduces Hogarth in order to challenge Warburton's claim in the 1751 Advertisement to having the best artists at work on the engravings. And he concludes, like Smart, with a mock advertisement:

In the Press, and speedily will be published,  
A NEW AND COMPLEAT EDITION OF THE MOST CELEBRATED  
IRISH CLASSICS. Compared with, and Corrected from  
the most Ancient and Authentic MANUSCRIPTS. By  
that Eminent Critic, Commentator, and Editor, the

<sup>120</sup>The ESTC catalogue entry for the 1754 edition of Pope's Works erroneously describes it as being 'Without Warburtons [sic] notes'. Warburton suggests moving the notes to the back of each poem in Appendix A (25 April and 9 June 1753; Egerton 1954. ff. 58, 62.).



R—d and Learned MASTER W—— W——. . .  
 N.B. These bound in black Calf-skin. . .  
 N.B. These in Sheepskin, or half-bound;  
 And BETTY IRELAND IN SHEETS.———

The Public may depend upon the Accuracy,  
Clearness, and Modesty of this Performance,  
 where no arbitrary or pedantic Conjectures  
 shall be imposed, but every thing elucidated  
 according to the strictest CANONS of ORTHODOX  
 CRITICISM. . .

The Work will also be astonishingly illus-  
 trated with [non-occasional] Notes, —By  
 —Phelim O'Blunder, Peter Grievous, Van Bullum  
Gronovius, and Scandlebag Night-Cart. . . (p. c)

The Supplement to the Works of Alexander Pope published  
 by Mary Cooper in 1757 has rarely, if ever, been acknowledged  
 as an anti-Warburton edition.<sup>121</sup> The preface maintains that  
 Warburton has refused to give reasons for his omission of  
 the verses making up the Supplement and then suggests he  
 has been too embarrassed by Bolingbroke, Richardson and Lady  
 Mary to include them in the Works.

Given the sheer volume of attacks against Warburton, it  
 is hardly surprising that he became anxious to discourage  
 any further outrages. When rumour had it that Sterne planned  
 to model Tristram's tutor after the recently consecrated  
 Bishop of Gloucester, Warburton asked Garrick to intercede.  
 Sterne replied in true hobby-horse rhetoric:

What the devil!—is there no one learned  
 blockhead throughout the many schools of

<sup>121</sup> See page 136, note 38, above. Mary Cooper also pub-  
 lished the 1743 Dunciad (P796), Pope's 1742 Works III ii,  
 the 1744 [Thomas Edwards?] Letter to the Author [i.e. War-  
 burton] and the 1746 Character of Katherine, late Duchess  
of Buckinghamshire.

misapplied science in the Christian World, to make a tutor of for my Tristram? Ex quovis ligno non fit. Are we so run out of stock, that there is no one lumber-headed, muddle-headed, mortar-headed, pudding-headed chap amongst our doctors? —Is there no single wight of much reading and no learning amongst the many children in my mother's nursery, who bid high for this charge——but I must disable my judgment by choosing a W[arburto]n?<sup>122</sup>

Garrick relayed the message to Warburton who later gave the 'heteroclite parson' a purse of guineas as well as advice on how to improve his writing style. Sterne was swift (as Joyce punned it) to thank his benefactor 'like an unbroken horse'; Warburton's offer to assist the subscription to Sterne's Sermons was viewed by the press as an attempt to buy his way out of ignominy.<sup>123</sup> Sterne may have had Warburton in mind when he sent his 'undertaking critick. . . riding like a madcap full tilt', but by the last volume he mentioned Divine Legation in the same breath as his own work and Tale of a Tub.<sup>124</sup>

Although Sterne may have, like his friend John Hall-Stevenson, made Warburton the butt of ridicule on occasion, they shared an interest in encyclopedic learning. Arthur

<sup>122</sup> Letters of Laurence Sterne, edited by Lewis Perry Curtis (Oxford, 1935), p. 93 (6 March 1760).

<sup>123</sup> See David Thomson, Wild Excursions: the life and fiction of Laurence Sterne (London, 1972), pp. 179-80. Warburton's 'bribe' was reported in European Magazine (October 1792), pp. 225-56, via St James Chronicle (10.4.1788).

<sup>124</sup> The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy Gentleman, edited by Ian Campbell Ross (Oxford, 1983), pp. 237, 497.

Cash describes the early manuscript version of Tristram Shandy as 'a satire structured along the lines of The Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus', and his summation of Sterne's reading might also match Warburton's tastes.<sup>125</sup> Later, from Paris, the celebrated author wrote to his bookseller, Thomas Becket, to send a shipment including 'All The Works of Pope—the neatest & cheapest Edition—(therefore I suppose not Warburtons) [sic].'<sup>126</sup>

The last main attacks on Warburton's editorial position were to be the most notorious, yet they were eclipsed by an even greater historical scandal. John Wilkes and Charles Churchill ruthlessly satirized Warburton not only as a pedant, but also as a cuckold. (Their Medmenhamite crony and profligate son of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Potter, was rumoured to be the father of Warburton's son.) Churchill describes Warburton's transformation thus:

A Curate first, he read and read,  
And laid in, whilst he should have fed  
The souls of his neglected flock,  
Of reading such a mighty stock,  
That he o'ercharg'd the weary brain  
With more than She could well contain  
More than She was with Spirits fraught  
To turn, and methodize to thought,  
And which, like ill-digested food,  
To humours turn'd and not to blood.

<sup>125</sup>Laurence Sterne: the early & middle years (London, 1975), pp. 205, 278. See also F. Doherty, 'Sterne and Warburton: another look' BJECS, vol. I i (Spring 1978), 20-30.

<sup>126</sup>Letters of Laurence Sterne, p. 166 (12 [May] 1762).

Brought up to London, from the plow  
 And Pulpit, how to make a bow  
 He try'd to learn, he grew polite,  
 And was the Poet's Parasite.<sup>127</sup>

Churchill's Duellist made him £400, but his satiric Dedication to Warburton wasn't published until after the poet's death.

Space does not permit a full treatment of An Essay on Woman, parts of which were read out in the House of Lords. Another pamphlet war raged, but the obscenity charges (for which Wilkes was eventually fined £500 and imprisoned for twelve months) were overshadowed by the North Briton no. 45 controversy, Wilkes' duel with Samuel Martin and the wounded man's flight to France. Warburton's letters to Ralph Allen are worth reading as a running commentary, although his House of Lords speech (which dwells on an arcane heretic by the name of Servetus who was burned 200 years earlier in Geneva) ironically proves one of Wilkes' points. Still, it was a sad case. The poem which Warburton had vindicated a quarter of a century earlier had been travestied along with his commentary. Pope's legacy had far more strings attached than most critics have been willing to notice. Pope's editor deserves more sympathy than scorn.

<sup>127</sup>The Duellist [1764], p. 35 [EUL: E.B..821608 Arm.]. See Raymond J. Smith, Charles Churchill (Boston, 1977) and Thomas Lockwood, Post-Augustan Satire: Charles Churchill and Satirical Poetry, 1750-1800 (Seattle, 1979).

#### IV

#### THE 1751 WORKS:

#### BACKGROUND OF AN EDITION

The last full year of the Julian calendar was a fairly significant one in literary history. In 1751 Hume's Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals and Gray's Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard sold in the shops, while across the channel Voltaire's Age of Louis XIV and the first volume of the Encyclopédie edited by Diderot and d'Alembert were published, the latter after much opposition from the Jesuit organ which had previously condemned An Essay on Man, the Mémoires de Trévoux. Fielding's last novel, Amelia, and Smollett's second, Peregrine Pickle, were available. And, for our purposes, the first posthumous edition of Pope's Works finally came out. Undertaken by a small group of booksellers headed by the Knaptons and printed by William Bowyer under Warburton's scrutiny, this edition embodied some of the finest talents of the eighteenth century book trade - its most precociously successful poet, its most 'learned' printer, and its most

controversial editor - and, accordingly, it attracted much public attention. Many people bought it out of curiosity (who might be named in Warburton's footnotes?), others acquired it because Pope was still de rigueur in polite company (Elizabeth Carter quoted him frequently in correspondence), while some simply wanted the most up-to-date text of a poet whose works they admired.

We could compile a fairly substantial list of original owners of the Warburton edition from various sources: library inventories, auction records, private correspondences, book-plates, and common sense. Some sets, like the cheaper small octavo of 1751 owned by Adam Smith, survive,<sup>1</sup> while others, like that owned by William Murray which went up in flames with the rest of his library in the mob violence of June 1780, sadly do not.<sup>2</sup> Warburton sent a list of names for complimentary sets to Knapton on 3 June 1751, although he questioned whether George Arbuthnot, one of Pope's executors, should have been included.<sup>3</sup> This list has not survived, but we can guess that Ralph Allen, Murray, and the two proofreaders, John Jortin and Thomas Birch, were on it. Just over a fortnight later, Warburton added, 'I forgot to have a Book sent in Bords to the Bishop of Lincoln'. Charles Yorke would have been another likely

<sup>1</sup>Smith's 1751 edition is in Edinburgh University Library (JA 1900-08).

<sup>2</sup>See Pat Rogers, Hacks and Dunces: Pope, Swift and Grub Street (London, 1972; abridged 1980), pp. 119-20.

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix A.



recipient.

Warburton's protégé and eventual editor, Richard Hurd, received a complimentary set of the 1753 edition which has been preserved in the Hartlebury Castle collection.<sup>4</sup> Soon after forwarding it, Warburton wrote to Hurd saying:

It may be just worth while to tell you, before I conclude, that the small edition of Pope which I sent you, is the correctest of all; and I was willing you should always see the best of me.<sup>5</sup>

Warburton perhaps called the 1753 edition 'the correctest' because he revised a footnote in the Essay on Criticism (I, 204, v. 632) to take into account the recent publication of the second volume of Hurd's Horatian translations which was dedicated to Warburton. Three days later, on 2 July 1753, Hurd eagerly acknowledged Warburton's gift. From Cambridge he wrote with editorial zeal:

Though my curiosity had not suffered me to neglect comparing the second edition of Pope in 8vo. with the first, which you gave me. And I had transcribed into it the most material corrections and alterations. But this smaller set is most acceptable to me, both for its being a

<sup>4</sup>I am grateful to Mrs V.L. Barnish, Bishop Hurd's librarian, for supplying me with information about the Hartlebury Castle collection.

<sup>5</sup>Letters of a late Eminent Prelate, edited by Richard Hurd (Kidderminster, 1808), p. 104 (30 June 1753).

proof of your kind remembrance of me;  
and also for the neatness and convenient  
size of the volume, so proper for that  
constant pocket use, which such a poet  
improved by such a critic deserves.<sup>6</sup>

Apart from overdoing the flattery - one wonders how Warburton accepted the puff, 'so proper for that constant pocket use' - Hurd diligently applied himself to collating and annotating his presentation set. To judge from his critical dissection of Warburton's notes and commentaries, Theophilus Cibber also must have had a heavily annotated edition. The Warburton edition would have been required reading for all Pope scholars and critics of the latter half of the eighteenth century: Dr Johnson, Joseph Spence, Thomas and Joseph Warton, Owen Ruffhead, Vicesimus Knox, Percival Stockdale, James Boswell, and Hugh Blair, to name but a few. In Scotland, Sir Walter Scott's 1751 edition is kept in the Abbotsford collection; Thomas Carlyle cobbled a set from three editions: the first two volumes of the 1787/8 London edition, volume IV of the 1764 Edinburgh edition, and volumes I and III-VIII of the 1795 London edition.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Letters of a late Eminent Prelate, p. 105 (2 July 1753). Warburton also reserved a set of the 1751 edition for William Mason on 11 July 1751 (p. 61) in recognition of his commemoration of Pope in his 1747 poem, 'Musaeus'.

<sup>7</sup> I have examined Scott's set of 1751a at Abbotsford briefly; there did not seem to be much in the way of annotation, but a more thorough search will have to be undertaken. See also Roger L. Tarr, 'Thomas Carlyle's Libraries at Chelsea and Ecclefechan', Studies in Bibliography, XXVII (1974), pp. 249-65 (p. 263).

Horace Walpole's catalogue lists three sets of Pope's Works: the 1717/35 collections in quarto; the small octavo 1741-43 set of four volumes in seven; and the 1751 large octavo Warburton edition. Walpole later added the 1757 Supplement to the Works, the 1776 Additions to the Works, and Ruffhead's Life of Pope which came out in 1769. The Strawberry Hill library, housing a remarkable collection of books written by Pope, attacking Pope, and once owned by Pope, also contained the 1745 Essay on Man bound up with the 1749 Essay on Criticism both edited by Warburton.<sup>8</sup>

This will suffice for the time being as a tentative list of illustrious owners of the Warburton edition. Royalty should not be forgotten, although Frederick, Prince of Wales, an erstwhile Twickenham visitor and recipient of one of Bounce's puppies (along with the immortal collar-couplet), was buried on 13 April 1751 - two months before the Warburton edition was published. What of the less than illustrious? Two sets at hand offer a glimpse of the range of Pope owners. The first is the 1752 large octavo edition in nine volumes which was once owned by Sir John Duntze,

<sup>8</sup>Allen T. Hazen, A Catalogue of Horace Walpole's Library, 3 vols (New Haven; London, 1969). Walpole acquired Pope's two-volume Greek and Latin edition of Homer's Opera (Amsterdam, 1697) with the inscriptions 'E libris A. Pope donum Dni. Pellet M.D. 1714' and 'E libris A. Pope Finished the translation in Feb. 1719/20 A. Pope', as well as a pencil sketch of Twickenham Church. Translations include Il riccio rapito by Andrea Bonducci (Florence, 1739) and La Dunciade by Charles Palissot de Montenoy ([Paris?], 1771). Walpole also owned Cibber's letters and works connected with the 1747 Patriot King.

Member of Parliament for Tiverton in Devonshire. The fact that he waited at least a year before buying the Warburton edition may suggest that he was not the most avid of Pope readers; at least he did not leave any annotations behind in any of the volumes. Perhaps this set was intended primarily for show, to fill a foot of shelf space with nine calf-bound, <sup>gold-tooled</sup> ~~gilt-edged~~ spines. Duntze may have dipped into Pope from time to time to liven up a speech or to plunder a stylish phrase from Pope's correspondence to enhance his own. Duntze was probably not a very fastidious collector: plate XXI, intended to face page 121 of volume V (which is the opening of the second book of the nearly eponymous Dunciad) appears never to have been inserted.

The second set, a cheap six-volume edition of 1770, was once owned by E.W. Hulse of 'Exon: Coll: Oxon: 1773'. By this time the market was well-saturated with editions of Pope. The imprint reads like a Who's Who of late eighteenth-century booksellers: 'Printed for C. Bathurst, W. Strahan, J. and F. Rivington, R. Baldwin, W. Johnston, T. Caslon, T. Longman, B. Law, Johnson and Davenport, T. Davies, T. Cadell, and W. and J. Richardson'. Like Duntze, Hulse did not rush out to buy his Warburton edition, nor did he mark passages which he especially admired. The lavish quarto edition of 1769 would presumably have been beyond Hulse's means; but the range of editions was such that M.P.s and students alike could choose their Pope reading in accord-

ance with the dictates of their pocketbooks. By 1770 a London bookseller could usher a potential buyer to well-stocked shelves of Pope editions. For the wealthier clientele there was the lavish quarto edition of 1769 (although few would be around to pick up the sixth volume published in 1807); for ordinary customers there were numerous octavo editions to choose from (on large, crown, or pot paper); and for the parsimonious there were duodecimos or under-the-counter piracies. Booksellers accommodated the needs of a growing and shifting market by producing as wide a range as possible of Pope editions so that buyers as diverse in age and occupation as Duntze and Hulse could easily select the edition most suited to their intended use and income. No poet's works had ever tapped so broad a market.

Figures for the first five editions of Pope's Works (see Appendix B) reflect the booksellers' anticipated sales. 10,750 sets (totalling 99,750 single volumes) of Pope's Works were produced from 1751 to 1754. The breakdown of numbers is such:

1751a	large 8 <sup>o</sup>	9 vols	1500
1751b	crown 8 <sup>o</sup>	9 vols	3000
1752	large 8 <sup>o</sup>	9 vols	750
1753	crown 8 <sup>o</sup>	9 vols	2500
1754	pot 8 <sup>o</sup>	10 vols	<u>3000</u>
		[total]	<u>10750 sets</u>

Judging by these figures, the booksellers reckoned that sales of the cheaper editions (in crown and pot) would outnumber the large octavo editions by roughly four to one. The market for the large octavo edition was apparently dwindling; sluggish sales of 1751a no doubt caused the booksellers to order half of the consignment in 1752. The availability of the cheaper crown edition - 1751b - would have made the large octavo 1752 edition harder to sell. Many of Warburton's notes and commentaries were omitted from the cheaper editions (with his permission) to keep costs down; and this must have made the compositor's job easier. The rise in production of the 1754 pot octavo (again a cheaper edition, but stretched out to ten volumes) suggests that sales <sup>of smaller sets</sup> were by no means declining.

Yet these figures represent production only, not sales. Booksellers would have to balance anticipated sales with the number of sets printed. A faulty prediction could mean a long-term backlog in the stock-room. The booksellers, however, felt quite safe with the turn-over of Pope editions in the shops. If, for example, sales had been disappointing for the first consignment of 1751b, then the booksellers would not have ordered 2500 sets in the same format in 1753. The run of 3000 sets in 1754 in a smaller format was intended to appeal to the lower end of the market, people who were becoming increasingly more literate yet might have been



balked by the cost of previous editions. Even by today's standards, a total of 10,750 multi-volume sets of the works of a dead poet is staggering. Assuming they all eventually went somewhere, Pope's Works did not seem to lose any popularity because of Warburton's editorship. If anything, Warburton's reputation ~~for~~ *and* polemics may have helped to boost sales. The number of posthumous editions attests to Pope's continuing influence well into the 1750s. More research needs to be done on the 'bestseller' aspect of Pope, his infiltrating effect on a massive new generation going into the Industrial Revolution, but for the moment, I would like to dwell on some of the more mundane aspects of the Warburton edition.

Having quoted the 10,750 sets produced within a five-year period, what do we do with them? Distribution of the Warburton edition would have been primarily limited to the London book-shops, although a small proportion would have been sent to other centres - Oxford and Cambridge, York, Manchester, Bristol, Birmingham, Exeter - or any bookseller who had dealings with London. James Leake, the major bookseller in Bath, had a reciprocal arrangement with the Knaptons; the two shops exchanged parcels frequently. With quick and reliable coach service between London and Bath, Ralph Allen could order a book such as Montfau<sup>u</sup>con's Antiquities of France or the Diction-ary of Commerce and have the order filled in little more

than a week. Along with the occasional small order went *might go* a larger consignment of Pope tomes.

Foreign publishers tended to reprint freely from the London edition. In Berlin, Frederic Nicolai published a ten-volume set of Pope's Works (1762/4), complete with portrait, plates, and Warburton's notes, which would have been exported to other countries on the continent wherever there was a demand for an English edition. None of the profits would go to the London copyright owners. Closer to home, there were at least three Dublin editions of Pope's Works published with Warburton's notes: two (1764 and 1770) published by J. Potts and J. Williams; and one (1769/70) by George Faulkner and Hulton Bradley. As there was no copyright law in Ireland, there was, in theory, nothing to prevent any bookseller from publishing Pope's Works, although unspoken codes of conduct applied within the book trade.<sup>9</sup>

Scottish publishers, technically bound by the copyright act of 1710, poured out various editions of Pope's Works, some more legitimate than others. The Foulis brothers in Glasgow formally requested permission to print Pope's Works, and paid 'ye sum of twenty pounds Sterl: value in paper furnished for printing Pope's Works'

<sup>9</sup> For a recent account of Irish and Scottish copyright disputes, see Catherine Coogan Ward and Robert E. Ward, 'Literary Piracy in the Eighteenth Century Book Trade: the cases of George Faulkner and Alexander Donaldson', Factotum, no. 17 (November 1983), pp. 25-35.

in 1756.<sup>10</sup> Competition amongst the less scrupulous booksellers could be fierce. Soon after John Balfour published his 1764 duodecimo edition of Pope's Works, Alexander Donaldson brought out a similar edition at half the price. Not only did Donaldson infringe upon the trade of his Edinburgh colleagues, he brazenly set up a shop in London to sell his cheap reprints openly, thus pioneering the cut-price book emporium.<sup>11</sup> His imprints proudly proclaimed 'sold at his shops in London and Edinburgh'. Entrepreneurial Scots publishers had created havoc for Pope's booksellers as early as 1718 when Thomas Johnson pirated the Works, out only a year before; his modus operandi was to buy a copy of a book in London, have it sent across the channel and quickly reprinted by his press in The Hague, and smuggle the unbound sheets - mixed in with Latin or French sheets to outwit customs, if need be - to Leith.<sup>12</sup> Johnson later proved even more troublesome for Bernard Lintot (whose initials appeared on the piracies) when he flooded

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix A: Edinburgh University Library MSS Dc.4.102 (2 September 1756). Also note, 'Gavin Hamilton, John Balfour and Patrick Neill: a study of publishing in Edinburgh in the eighteenth century' by Warren McDougall, Ph.D. thesis (Edinburgh, 1974): 'William Warburton, claiming the copyright of the Works of Alexander Pope, objected when Robert Foulis was printing Pope's Letters in 1754, but upon Foulis's writing to the Attorney-General William Murray, Warburton was advised to come to a financial settlement' (pp. 101-02).

<sup>11</sup> Warren McDougall, 'Gavin Hamilton, Bookseller in Edinburgh', British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies, vol. I, no. 1 (Spring 1978), 1-19, p. 10.

<sup>12</sup> McDougall, 'Gavin Hamilton', p. 4.

the market with a cheap edition of Pope's Iliad.<sup>13</sup>  
 In many cases, however, piracy was a necessary evil, the only way books could be distributed (and greater knowledge spread) to the far corners of the world. Consignments of Pope's Works no doubt found their way to America, although presumably these would have been paid for in advance.

Translations were obviously another outlet, although selected editions would have been more profitable than the complete works. Pope welcomed the rapid translation of the Essay on Man by de Silhouette into French in 1736 (although he would regret the repercussions) and he encouraged Christopher Smart to attempt a Latin translation. Warburton was cautious about permitting John Sayer to go ahead with his Latin Essay on Man, mainly because he wanted to print the English text (which was Warburton's property) alongside the translation.<sup>14</sup> Still, there was nothing to prevent anyone from publishing a translation outside of Britain. As late as 1810, a translation entitled Ensaio Sobre a Critica which took full advantage of Warburton's commentaries (as well as 'Notas de José Warton') was published in Rio de Janeiro.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup>See Sherburn, Early Career, pp. 188-89.

<sup>14</sup>See Appendix A (Egerton 1954. ff. 76-79; 85-86).

<sup>15</sup>A copy of this Portuguese translation may be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

By the mid eighteenth century, printing technology of the English book trade had gleaned all it could from continental practices, and, with the development of native type foundries and paper mills, the British book industry was rapidly becoming the best in the world. Printing costs in the 1750s ate up only about half of the total production costs (as opposed to 75% in the sixteenth century), although overheads, interest rates, wages, and miscellaneous expenses (for ink, candles, replacement of old type and broken ornaments, repairs to presses, and so on) were slowly mounting.<sup>16</sup>

With the improvement of roads, the construction of stronger and more durable bridges, and a more organized postal system (thanks to Ralph Allen), publishers and booksellers could distribute their wares more rapidly. And easier transportation meant that booksellers in London could take the occasional business trip to improve trade with the provinces, to see what new authors might be worth publishing, and to see what innovations were being made elsewhere. Andrew Millar, no doubt hoping to curry some favour next time Pope copyrights were up for sale, made a trip to Prior Park to talk over 'several absurd things' with Warburton not long after the first

<sup>16</sup> See Philip Gaskell, A New Introduction to Bibliography (Oxford, 1972), especially 'The English Book Trade to 1800', pp. 173-85.

Pope edition came out.<sup>17</sup> A decade later, Warburton was considering changing the printer of Pope's Works to John Baskerville of Birmingham.<sup>18</sup> Distance was becoming much less of an impediment in the publishing world.

What then of the actual publication of Pope's Works? One wishes Adam Smith had dissected for analysis a printer's shop rather than a pin-maker's in the opening of The Wealth of Nations, but the principle of the division of labour still applies (and with much greater complexity). The technology involved in the production of the Pope edition is too complicated to go into here, but we might begin to trace a vague outline by passing over trees (for paper), cows and goats (for leather bindings), linseed oil and resins (for ink), and lead and tin mines (for printing types) - to name but a few raw materials. Once all the essential ingredients have been refined to a state where they may be used by the printing industry, the number of operations from printing, binding, distributing, and selling is staggering. Bowyer's printing house alone employed ninety-two different pressman and ninety different compositors between March 1730 and April 1739 (some doing short

<sup>17</sup>Egerton 1954.f.32 (19 October 1751); see Appendix A.

<sup>18</sup>Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, V, 653 (letter to Hurd, 27 December 1761).



stints or part-time work); the work flow would have been just as complex in the late 1740s (when Bowyer began the long job of printing the first posthumous edition of Pope's Works) and 1750s.<sup>19</sup>

But various details had to be settled even before Bowyer was given his first sheet of copy. Warburton and the booksellers had to agree on such matters as format, number of volumes, arrangement, and cuts. The pre-publication stages of this venture, involving a great capital outlay and slow return, would have begun soon after Pope's death when Warburton had decided that he wanted the Knaptons to undertake the publication of the Works. As they were publishing his Shakespeare edition, the Knaptons must have seemed the easiest choice; they also offered him a fair proportion of the profits and had a fine reputation. The Knaptons, not wanting to take the full risk of financing the edition, farmed out some of it (the first two volumes) to the Tonsons, Henry Lintot, and Somerset Draper. Draper seems to have been a silent partner who drew up the abstract of accounts for the first five editions.<sup>20</sup> Although his name does not appear on the 1751 imprint, Charles Bathurst was later given a share of the profits.

Once it was settled who was doing what, the publishers

<sup>19</sup> Gaskell, New Introduction to Bibliography, p. 174.

<sup>20</sup> See Appendix B.

then contracted William Bowyer (son of the man who first worked off the sheets of Pope's Works in 1717) to print the edition, giving him their specifications. These would include such details as number of volumes printed, order of poems throughout the set, format, quality of paper, styles of type, width of margins, and so forth. Bowyer would have to estimate how many compositors, journeymen, pressmen, and correctors he would need for the job.

Various artisans would be commissioned to do the twenty-four cuts in the edition. What themes, subjects, and inscriptions for these engravings would have to be decided upon in advance by Warburton and the publishers, although as late as 20 December 1750 Warburton suggested to Knapton that Thomas Major should be asked to do the engraving for the sixth volume.<sup>21</sup> Towards the completion of the edition, any contact between Warburton and Bowyer seems to have been done through Knapton; relations between editor and printer were strained enough from the outset when Warburton complained about the press-work: 'I must needs tell you it is miserable work'.<sup>22</sup> Warburton's later intrusions by way of cancellations, inserts, and last-minute changes would have driven many a printer to convert the lead of his type fount into bullets. But after numerous delays caused by Warburton's revisions, the edition finally appeared in June 1751.

<sup>21</sup>Egerton 1954.f.17; see Appendix A.

<sup>22</sup>Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, II, 228 (12 Dec. 1748); see Appendix A.

What would it have been like to be a prospective buyer in 1751? Shall we, briefly, trace the path of a contemporary Pope addict? Following a custom of eighteenth-century anonymity, let him or her for the time being be called W----s. W----s has heard the odd rumour flying about town that Warburton's edition is soon to be published. Warburton himself has written of the impending date in a letter to Balguy, tentatively mentioning 'Mr. Pope's Works, which will be published on the 1st., 2nd. or 3rd. of June'.<sup>23</sup> Two weeks later, Horace Walpole is still waiting:

Warburton publishes his edition of Pope next week, with the famous piece of prose on Lord Hervey, which he formerly suppressed at my uncle's desire, who got an abbey from Cardinal Fleury for one Southcote, a friend of Pope's: my Lord Hervey pretended not to thank him. I am told the edition has waited, because Warburton has cancelled above a hundred sheets, (in which he had inserted notes) since the publication of the Canons of Criticism.<sup>24</sup>

W----s, who is privy to at least some of the gossip going around, has properly discounted it: the entire edition is less than two hundred sheets, and Warburton's annotations

<sup>23</sup> Griffith, vol. II, 524. The source for this letter is not given, although it was sent from Bedford Row on 23 May 1751; Griffith notes it is unpublished.

<sup>24</sup> Quoted in part by Griffith (above); see The Correspondence of Horace Walpole, edited by W.S. Lewis et al (New Haven, 1937-83), 48 vols, vol. 9, 116-17 (to Montagu, 13 June 1751).

will figure in only about a third of those. Bowyer's rapidly diminishing patience with Warburton's complaints about press-work may have given rise to some inflated figures, and last-minute changes were no doubt made, but Warburton is hardly the sort to give satisfaction to a critic like Thomas Edwards.

It is now just over seven years since Pope died, and in the intervening period - last rites to first 'things' - there have been various tempests which have kept the dust from settling on the poet's grave. Bolingbroke is particularly concerned that Warburton will malign him in his intended biography of Pope; and Warburton has a score to settle with David Mallet whom he suspects has had something to do with the Advertisement to the 1749 publication of the Idea of a Patriot King and the rebuttal to Warburton's Letter to the Editor, the face-slapping Familiar Epistle to the most Impudent Man living. There is likely to be more animosity stirred up by Warburton's editorial remarks. W----s decides to put some money away.

Finally, in the June issue of London Magazine (which probably arrives early in July), W----s spots the notice. Item number seven under 'Entertainment and Poetry' reads:

The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq; compleat in  
9 Vols. 8vo. pr. 2l. 2s. in Sheets. Knapton.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> London Magazine, XX (June, 1751), 288 [italics mine].

Two guineas is a considerable expenditure to a person of W----s's means; to someone receiving an annual income of <sup>£105</sup>~~£120~~ it represents one-fiftieth, which is a considerable allotment for one set of books. Two guineas could pay for a month's pub suppers. Or, to put it another way, for the same amount of money, W----s could buy such essential reading matter as: A Treatise of the true Seat of the Glanders in Horses (20s.), the four-volume duodecimo edition of Peregrine Pickle (12s.), Benjamin Franklin's Experiments and Observations on Electricity (2s. 6d.), books II to V of The Scribleriad (4s.), Fielding's Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robberies (2s. 6d.), and still have a shilling left over to choose between The Adventures of Shelim O'Blunder or An Essay on the Venereal Gleet.<sup>26</sup>

At least the Pope edition costs six shillings less than the eight-volume set of Shakespeare which Warburton edited in 1747. Apart from a rather pallid Vertue frontispiece of the bard, there are no engravings in the Pope-Warburton Shakespear. As Pope's Works are being sold 'in Sheets', binding will be an added cost. Depending on how extravagant W----s feels when making purchase, the Pope edition might be bound in red morocco (like Pope's own set of his Homer translations), goat imported from

<sup>26</sup> All titles and prices have been selected from London Magazine, XX (January - July, 1751).

the Mediterranean, home-bred calf, or (most likely, as they were cheapest and W----s could later have them replaced) paper boards.

The taste of the town prevails. W----s, who wants to get ahead in life (meaning, if the Warburton edition is going to be a prime source of literary conversation in the coming season, W----s had better procure a set), sets aside an afternoon to make the big purchase. A week or so later, we find W----s, knotted sock well hidden, strolling along the Strand and Fleet Street towards St Paul's. On the right, W----s sees that Gosling's Bank is flourishing 'over against St. Dunstan's Church' (and wonders whether an account might be better than a sock). Across the street is the old Lud Gate, dating back to Roman times, named after the Celtic god of water-worship. The heads of King Lud and his two sons had been lopped off during the reign of Edward VI, but Queen Mary later had them replaced. The only known statue of Queen Elizabeth can be seen from the western side of the Gate. Now in Ludgate Street, W----s soon spots the Knaptons' premises. There, in a dusty window, is the title-page with almost as much red ink as black: 'The Works of Alexander<sup>Pope</sup>/Esq. in nine volumes complete. With his last corrections, additions, and improvements; as they were delivered to the editor a little before his death: together with the commentary and notes of Mr. Warburton. London, printed for J. and P. Knapton, H. Lintot, J. and



R. Tonson and S. Draper. MDCCLI.' It encompasses a man's poetical works - a life's worth of inspiration, discipline, refining, and embellishing - all tied up in a bundle and despatched to a more able-bodied editor, and presented here 'as they were delivered to the editor a little before his death'. To those impervious to the coy dramatics of title-pages, the set recommends itself by virtue of its definitiveness. But is it really complete?

W----s will risk it. Selecting the least scruffy quire of sheets, W----s hands over the money. John Knapton may suggest a good binder to W----s, or he may even have something in a trade binding for those more concerned with readings than objets d'art. It is possible W----s carted the set home that day. Alternatively, the binder might have a waterman or young apprentice deliver the set when ready. The subtle pressures on both sides of the transaction - the buyer's and the seller's - were probably much the same as they are today. The proprietor wants to make a quick sale, while the customer dithers over the price of the goods. W----s might even consider waiting for the small octavo to come out in the autumn, but in saving fifteen shillings, W----s will have lost prestige in social circles and the personal cachet of the moment. The purchase is done.

. . .

[Overleaf: Warburton's frontispiece to Pope's Works  
(see also prefatory title-pages for 1751 volume I)]

### The 1751 Frontispiece

Looked at side by side, the 1751 frontispiece and title-page form a curious implicit statement about the role of the editor in relation to the poet. Pope's name obviously takes top billing on the title-page, printed large and in red, well over Warburton's name in small black caps towards the bottom. Yet the more central and more radiant figure in the frontispiece is Warburton's. Although Pope larded Warburton's ego with such self-effacing comments as:

It is certain, you have a full right to  
any I could do you, who not only monthly  
but weekly of late have loaded me with  
Favours, of that kind which are most  
acceptable to veteran Authors; those  
Garlands which a Commentator weaves to hang  
about his Poet, & which are Flowers both  
of his own gathering & Painting too, not<sup>1</sup>  
Blossomes springing from the dry Author.<sup>1</sup>

he may not have entirely agreed with the implied meaning of the frontispiece.

Plate I (opposite) of the 1751 edition was designed by the Irish artist, Nicholas Blakey (fl. 1749-53), and engraved by Thomas Major (1720-99). Being the first engraving prospective buyers were likely to focus on, it received

<sup>1</sup>Correspondence, IV, 399-400 (5 June [1742]). Footnote numbers run consecutively by sections rather than chapters.

special attention. The selling point of good 'cuts' in eighteenth-century books is not to be underestimated; the popular addiction to coffee brought with it a subsidiary craving for the coffee-table book. Warburton took a particular interest in commissioning Major to do an engraving. This was perhaps his shrewdest attempt at publicizing the edition. From Prior Park Warburton wrote to Knapton, 'I saw Mr Dingley the other day who has an influence with Major the engraver who says he is come back to England.'<sup>2</sup> Warburton had in mind an engraving for the sixth volume portraying Pope in company with Homer and Shakespeare to emphasize Pope's prefaces to their works. This letter was written as late as 20 December 1750, by which time Bowyer had probably received plate XXIV from Hayman and Grignion (not surprisingly on the same theme Warburton suggests) to preface the sixth volume. Still, Knapton or Bowyer thought it was a good idea and may have scrapped an earlier frontispiece for the sake of Major's engraving.

Major had attracted some publicity after he rather unwisely followed his master Gravelot back to Paris in 1745. In the following year, after Culloden and the Duke of Cumberland's Jacobite abattoir, Major was thrown into the Bastille for ten days. (He later forgave the French

<sup>2</sup>Egerton 1954.f.17: see Appendix A.

and praised them for their 'civility'.) More recently, Major had achieved some measure of success when he completed the work of his dead friend, Andrew Lawrence; 'Death of the Stag' was dedicated to one of Warburton's patrons, Lord Chesterfield. The connection between Warburton and Major is not difficult to discern.

Although communications between designer, engraver, and printer were generally minimal at this time, Warburton seems to have given fairly specific instructions regarding the composition of the frontispiece. From the artist who executed the design for the line engraving - Blakey - comes the following anecdote (as recorded by Malone):

Mr. Burke, who avowed he knew little of art, though he admired it and knew many of the professors, was acquainted with Blakey the artist, who made the drawing for the frontispiece to Warburton's edition of Pope's works. He told him it was to Warburton's particular desire that he made him the principal figure, and Pope only secondary; and that the light, contrary to the rules of art, goes upward from Warburton to Pope. A gentleman who was present when Mr. B. mentioned this circumstance, remarked that it was observable the poet and<sup>3</sup> his commentator were looking different ways.<sup>3</sup>

The latter observation with its suggestion that Pope and Warburton were opposed in more ways than one should be taken in a light vein; the frontispiece would look distinct-

<sup>3</sup>James Prior, Life of Malone (London, 1860), pp. 370-71, "Maloniana"; quoted by Wimsatt, p. 340 (no. 67.1).

ly off-balance if both profiles were to face in the same direction. It could, of course, have been designed differently, omitting Warburton's image entirely, but there was no precedent this sort of frontispiece - an author in the presence of his posthumous editor - hence no protocol to follow. Nonetheless, Pope, at least in theory, approved of author and editor going down in posterity together, if some of the high-flown sentiments in his correspondence are to be believed.

Pope, however, might not have been pleased with the end result. For one thing, he is given what Wimsatt accurately describes as a 'lean and rather sour profile'. His image is perceptibly smaller than that of Warburton, and Warburton's medallion (facing the title-page) dominates the middle of the composition. The exact mid-point between height and width falls on Warburton's forehead. But the most audacious feature, as Blakey pointed out, is the lighting. The brightest area surrounds Warburton's head; a dark line at the base of his medallion accentuates the editor's image even more. Pope suffers by comparison; the white base and darkened features with the shadow at the top of his head create the effect of the poet being caught in unbecoming profile by the head-beams of his editor. Warburton looks like a Roman emperor; Pope a sinister back-bencher. Warburton is the one who is flanked by the muses of writing and music, while Pope has just been



propped up by a couple of cherubs. The overall effect is that Warburton has illuminated Pope, not that Pope has provided Warburton with an escape from obscurity. All enlightenment, the frontispiece seems to say, will come from the editor; all poetic codes, all veiled meanings, all suspect mysteries will be explained away under Warburton's editorial stamp.

Reviews by the press generally passed over the frontispiece, although one reviewer noted the absence of Pope's frontispiece to the Essay on Man in Gentleman's Magazine.<sup>4</sup> However, at least two of Warburton's more aggressive critics - John Gilbert Cooper and Theophilus Cibber - paused to consider the 1751 frontispiece. Cooper disparaged Warburton's general taste in art before passing a prolonged satirical judgement on the frontispiece proper:

For my own Part I should have thought nothing would have been so proper a Frontispiece to this Work as a Bust of the Poet himself, taken from a Painting of some good Master, and engraven by Houbracken, Boitard, or one of the most eminent Hands in Europe. Instead of which, the Plate is embarrassed with a trite tasteless Group of allegorical Personages.<sup>5</sup>

Attacking the choice of artists and engravers is easily

<sup>4</sup>GM, XXI (August, 1751), 344. Pope's frontispiece is discussed in Appendix F.

<sup>5</sup>John Gilbert Cooper, Cursory Remarks on Mr. Warburton's New Edition of Mr. Pope's Works (1751), p. 25.

done, but commissioning them was the responsibility of the Knaptons or Bowyer, not Warburton (although he had the power to veto any engravings which he thought were substandard). The hiring of London (as opposed to continental) artists seems altogether reasonable; home-grown engravers had to be groomed by the book trade, and in most cases they went abroad to polish their skills. The Knaptons had already dealt with Houbraken, who did the engraving of Pope, among others, for the two-volume Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain (1743/51), but there could be snags with cross-channel communications. There was little guarantee that an artist on the continent would fulfil all obligations. At the time the Pope edition was published Warburton wrote to Knapton saying, 'I am sorry Houbracken [sic] has served you so rascally.'<sup>6</sup> So Cooper's complaint is partly unfair, although his preference of an engraved bust of the poet is well taken.

Cooper then turns a cynical eye to the composition of the frontispiece, beginning with the deities on each side of Warburton:

On the Left is a great Motherly Figure representing a Virgin Muse, squatting upon a Cloud, and casting a Boeotian Countenance in an extatic Glare up to Heaven. On the Right we are presented with the Idea of Biography

<sup>6</sup>Egerton 1954.f.19 (3 June 1751); see Appendix A.

under the lovely Form of a full-breasted Angel, with her Eye fixed upon her admired Muse. She has a Book upon her Lap, and a Pen in her Left Hand, ingeniously denoting thereby that she is very awkwardly writing the Life of the Poet the Muse inspired. To compleat the Whole, a Pyramid in the middle is surcharged, as the Heralds call it, with a very small medalllic Bust of Mr. Pope in Profile; to which is linked below a very fat Head, hung there, I suppose, (as the Middlesex Justices do other Heads in Cases of Murder) to find an Owner; for as a Ballad-Maker wittily and wisely upon one of those Occasions

"We all conclude there must have been  
"A Body to this Head."<sup>7</sup>

Overlooking its entertainment value - the angelic, left-handed, motherly-virgin, muse-biographer - Cooper's critique draws our attention to the biography Warburton is, at this time, planning to write, and how this is interpreted by the artist. Clio (for we assume the writing of biographies falls under her domain) looks in the same direction as Warburton towards the works, with Euterpe in her direct line of vision. Thus the viewer is intended to associate the muse writing in her book with Warburton. This leaves us with Euterpe and Pope, yet Euterpe is looking up, not towards Pope, but the skies. Pope, on the other hand, is looking away from everything, although a cherub is inattentively pointing

<sup>7</sup>Cooper, Cursory Remarks, pp. 25-26.

at him. Thus Pope is isolated above while Warburton is subliminally connected with the creative process going on below.

Where Cooper's attack loses much of its force on minute details of composition, deflecting the argument with a pun, Theophilus Cibber directly introduces the question of Warburton's audacity with some dramatic flair:

Behold the Frontispiece!—what a Parade!  
How modest the Design too! See there poor  
Pope lifted towards the Skies, not by his own  
Works, but by his Legatee EDITOR, whose comely  
Countenance adorns the Centre of the Picture,

There stares tremendous, with a threat'ning Eye,  
Like some fierce Tyrant in old Tapestry.

and is conspicuously placed as a Support to  
the Poet. Behold him there engraved, like the  
Name of a scurvy Statuary, in larger Characters,  
and more deeply indented in the Sculpture, than  
the Inscription, which should be the most striking,  
to declare whose Memory the clumsy Design  
pretends to perpetrate. Since he would not  
leave the Bard alone,—why did he not call  
in more Company?—The more the merrier.<sup>8</sup>

But Warburton was not one to be swayed by banter or sarcasm; the frontispiece remained. If anything, the re-engraving in the 1770 duodecimo edition emphasizes the light beams emanating from Warburton's image even more. The Blakey-Major frontispiece was not used in the 1769

<sup>8</sup>Theophilus Cibber, A Familiar Epistle to Mr. Warburton (1753), p. xiv.

quarto edition. Instead, Warburton commissioned two separate engravings for this deluxe edition: one of Pope by Ravenet after Kneller which served as a frontispiece to Ruffhead's Life (the unnumbered fifth volume of the 1769 set) and another of himself in profile by William Hoare, facing the first page of the Life.<sup>9</sup> Also prominent in the Ruffhead biography was the line engraving of Pope's monument which Warburton had erected in 1761. Monument and engraving both proclaim Warburton's association with the poet:

ALEXANDRO POPE  
M.H.  
GULIELMUS EPISCOPUS GLOCESTRIENSIS  
AMICITIÆ CAUSA FAC. CUR.  
MDCCLXI.

Warburton, when he was having the frontispiece to his own works done, had the engraver include a medallion of Pope in the background.<sup>10</sup> Again Pope appears in shaded profile while Warburton - with right hand pausing in the labour of his Divine Legation and left hand a little too low for his heart (suggesting, perhaps, indigestion caused by mixing a bland diet of ecclesiastical writing with the

<sup>9</sup> See Wimsatt, pp. 82-84 (no. 8.2). In some sets (e.g. BL:77.1.3) the Kneller-Ravenet engraving appears as the frontispiece to the first volume of the Works.

<sup>10</sup> Wimsatt, pp. 340-45 (nos. 67.2, 67.3, 67.4).

sauce of secular editing) - radiates with religious zeal.

The extent of Warburton's self-promotional intrusions upon Pope iconography has irritated some critics, but Pope, at least in theory, might have welcomed a pictorial image of their association. It would be difficult, however, to imagine him being pleased with the execution of the 1751 frontispiece, given its intimations of editorial usurpation. Warburton might justify his presence by reminding his critics of the great sacrifice he made in editing Pope's works at the expense of his own. By vindicating the Essay on Man, Warburton chanced upon a great opportunity for material gain (which brought with it, through Ralph Allen's influence, a bishopric), yet becoming Pope's editor created a conflict of interests which would never be fully resolved. There was a built-in contradiction in a man of the cloth (with a Protestant cut) acting on behalf of a Catholic poet whose reputation was sometimes touched by scandal. Warburton did not mind the occasional flinging of mud on his cassock, but he may not have been fully aware of the deluge in store for him as Pope's editor. Perhaps he felt he deserved more recognition for his part in the revision of the Dunciad: the implicit pomposity of 1751 engraving might be interpreted as being an inverted reaction of an inferiority complex, the editor gnashing at being second-best. Whatever view is taken, the frontispiece remains a curious reflection of a unique literary relationship.



### Warburton's Advertisement

If the 1751 frontispiece conveys an implicit sense of Warburton's self-idealized role as Pope's editor, the Advertisement which follows makes explicit some of his grievances. The job of tending Pope's works (to understate the case) has not been the most gratifying - more of an odious obligation than a leisurely, scholarly pursuit. Warburton is perhaps not quite so inured to criticism as he would like to think, and the bitterness in the wake of his Shakespeare edition shows. Worse, he anticipates a cold reception for Pope's Works.

The editor opens by clarifying his own position in a defensive manner. Pope, he explains, 'was even solicitous to prevent any share of the offense they [his Works] might occasion, from falling on the Friend whom he had engaged to give them to the Public'.<sup>1</sup> To press the point of his editorial authority upon his readers, Warburton footnotes two documents on his opening page: the first, a letter from Pope in which he hands over the responsibility of editorship over to Warburton; the second, the relevant clause in Pope's will (ending 'WITHOUT FUTURE ALTERATIONS') which legitimizes Warburton's legacy.

The edition, then, is Warburton's 'discharge of this

<sup>1</sup>Pope, Works (1751), vol. I, Advertisement, iii.

trust' to Pope, and the editor proceeds to recommend the present volumes to his readers. In case the phrase, 'In Nine Volumes Complete', sounds ambiguous on the title-page, Warburton promises, 'the Public has here a complete Edition of his Works; executed in such a manner, as, I am persuaded, would have been to his satisfaction'. The question of completeness will be taken up shortly; but Pope's hypothetical satisfaction is immediately thrown into relief by Warburton's first commendation: 'The Editor hath not, for the sake of profit, suffered the Author's Name to be made cheap by a Subscription'. Leaving aside the matter of Warburton's profits, the attack on subscription is ill-conceived. Pope did quite well by this form of patronage which guaranteed the financial success of his Iliad and Odyssey translations as well as his edition of Shakespeare. If anyone, Pope showed that subscription could be used to improve the writer's and editor's lot, and lists were good publicity. Pope himself subscribed to a number of worthwhile projects, including the Knaptons' expensive venture, Heads of Illustrious Persons (1743/51), which may have required funding from 1738 onwards.

Subscription may have been abused or temporarily out of fashion, but it no doubt helped the bookseller to stave off mounting debts over a long period of time. The main disadvantages to this method were the uncertain period between deposit and publication, fraud, and mismanagement.

Those who subscribed to Johnson's edition of Shakespeare a year after the fruition of his Dictionary had to wait considerably longer than the Proposals promised, and when Johnson's Shakespeare was finally ready to be distributed (1765) the much embarrassed editor had to confess he had lost the list of subscribers and spent the money.<sup>2</sup> Still, Warburton's disparagement of subscription is uncalled for; he himself responded immediately to Hogarth's announcement for his Analysis of Beauty, ordering two copies, in 1752.<sup>3</sup> More likely, the Pope edition did not need a subscription in order to sell itself, and Warburton (now, more or less, a permanent resident at Prior Park) lacked the sort of charismatic salesmanship needed to make such a scheme work. Warburton's comment could serve only to fluster purchasers of his Pope edition who had previously subscribed to other worthy literary schemes.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> John Knapton's name appears on the imprint of the Proposals for Johnson's edition of Shakespeare's plays. Warburton's anti-subscription stance may have raised Knapton's eye-brows, but the publisher evidently did not want to tangle with the editor over the Advertisement.

<sup>3</sup> BL: Add.MSS. 27,995.f.7. (28 March 1752); see Appendix A.

<sup>4</sup> See Book Subscription Lists: a revised guide compiled by F.J.G. Robinson and P.J. Wallis (Newcastle, 1975) for subscriptions to Pope. Fifty-four books had been published by subscription before 1688; there are a thousand lists before 1761. See also Paul J. Korshin, 'Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage', Eighteenth-Century Studies, VII (1974), 453-73. For a study of one of Pope's supporters, see Jacques Carré, 'Burlington's Literary Patronage', BJECS, vol. V, no. 1 (Spring, 1982), 21-33.

Warburton explains the delay in bringing his edition before the public: 'It was his regard to family-interests of his deceased Friend.' Seven years is not a long time by today's standards to prepare a 'definitive' edition, but Warburton's notes and commentaries for the two Essays, the Epistles to Several Persons, and the Dunciad were in a fairly complete stage at the time of Pope's death. One wonders how Bolingbroke would have reacted to Warburton's benign admission:

Mr. Pope, at his death, left large impressions of his Works, unsold; the property of which was adjudged to belong to his Executors; and the Editor was willing they should have time to dispose of them to the best advantage, before the publication of this Edition (which hath been long prepared) should put a stop to the sale.<sup>5</sup>

It made good sense to wait until the market was ready for a new Pope edition, but Warburton's amenable delaying of publication for the sake of Pope's executors is a sham. Warburton refrains from pointing out that several small octavo editions of the Essay on Man<sup>6</sup> as well as the 1749 Essay on Criticism and the 1749/50 Dunciad have been published under his imprimatur. The suppressed 1744 Epistles

<sup>5</sup>Works, I, iv-v.

<sup>6</sup>See K.I.D. Maslen, 'New Editions of Pope's Essay on Man 1745-48', PBSA, 62 (1968), 177-88.

to Several Persons seems to have been released under the Knapton imprint in 1748.<sup>7</sup>

Perhaps Warburton's Advertisement is more significant for what it fails to reveal. Various sins have been committed - those of addition as well as omission - throughout the nine volumes. The third volume, for instance, opens with John Brown's Essay on Satire, and its main reason for being there is its unctuous address to Pope's editor. Brown wrote his Essay on Satire not long after Pope's death. When Warburton read the anonymous tribute, he asked Robert Dodsley the name of the author. The second edition, somewhat enlarged, was dedicated to Warburton in 1749. Warburton decided to include it in the Works, right before the 'Moral Essays'. Possibly Warburton felt he deserved some form of honour (along the same lines as the dedicatory poems in the 1717 Works). The Essay's location may have been strategically planned in the aftermath of the Patriot King paper war: it comes just before the Essay on Man. Another addition, which takes up much less space than the Essay on Satire, appears in the fourth volume. In a prefatory note to Parnell's versification of Donne III, Warburton explains his reasons for including it: he wished Pope had attempted it; Parnell's version will show how <sup>much</sup> better Pope's are by comparison.

Some of Warburton's sins of omission were revealed in the

<sup>7</sup>Twickenham III ii, xiii and n. 3: 'about 1748 all the unsold copies of Pope's poems [e.g. Epistles to Several Persons] were sold by the executors to Warburton'. See Egerton 1954.ff.3-7 (n.d.) in Appendix A below.

1757 Supplement (e.g. Sober Advice which had appeared in Pope's Works II ii in 1738, 1740 and 1743 and 'Likewise to letters and epigrams, not inserted in the late editions of Mr. Pope's Works'). In the case of Warburton's unnoted excisions of the Double Mistress episode in the Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus, Charles Kerby-Miller accuses him of 'Seeking only to annotate the Memoirs sufficiently to make good his claim to the copyright on it under the terms of Pope's will'.<sup>8</sup> Warburton also followed Pope in 'cooking' some of their correspondence.<sup>9</sup> One contemporary buyer wrote a note to Gentleman's Magazine querying the absence of Pope's design for the Essay on Man, while Theophilus <sup>Cibber</sup> later cried: 'No, but he has enlarged the Work with a Vengeance;—and had all he has cram'd into it been omitted, the Edition would not have been the worse; it had been less voluminous, and the Bookseller might have afforded it at less Price'.<sup>10</sup>

Warburton complained about the printing of the heading to the Advertisement which seems to have resulted in the perpetuation of the nine-volume plan even when the number of volumes varied. So with the ten-volume edition of 1754, the Advertisement was not adapted, even though Warburton had, following Pope's advice, saved some caustic remarks for later editions.

<sup>8</sup> See his edition of the Memoirs (New Haven, 1950), pp. 65-66.

<sup>9</sup> For a Warburtonian conflation see Correspondence IV, 434-35.

<sup>10</sup> GM, XXI (August 1751), 344; A Familiar Epistle to Mr. Warburton from Theophilus Cibber (1753), xvii-xviii.



### Arbuthnot: Epistle or Dialogue?

Warburton has often been accused of editorially tampering with Pope's most autobiographical poem. The two charges consist of a) the editor demolished its independent status by converting it into 'A Prologue to the Satires' and b) he changed it from an epistle to a dialogue, thereby rendering it as a conversation rather than a personal letter. Commenting on the second charge, John Butt, in his Note on the Text in the Twickenham edition, writes, 'some of the interjections were put into Arbuthnot's mouth, thus changing the poem from an epistle from Pope to Arbuthnot to a dialogue between them.' His summation of the two editorial alterations is such: 'That Pope had authorized all these changes is open to doubt. The new addition to the title he certainly did not authorize.'<sup>1</sup>

Thus Butt overrides the 1751 dialogue format, removing the 'P' and 'A' markings in the text at such places as:

[P] Let Sporus tremble—A. What? that thing of silk,  
Sporus, that mere white curd of Ass's milk?  
 Satire or sense, alas! can Sporus feel?  
 Who breaks a butterfly upon a wheel?  
 P. Yet let me flap this bug with gilded wings,<sup>2</sup>

and Davis also omits the dialogue markings in his 1966

<sup>1</sup>Twickenham IV, 93.

<sup>2</sup>Works IV (1751), 36-37, ll. 305-09.

Oxford Standard Authors edition. Courthope, in spite of his substantial case against Arbuthnot's 'Prologue' designation and his critical disdain for Warburton's other editorial machinations, preserves both 1751 innovations in his 1881 text.

One would think such matters of presentation would have been resolved after so many decades of scholarly scrutiny; yet William K. Wimsatt evinces a dissenting opinion in his American edition, Alexander Pope: Selected Poetry and Prose (1951; reprinted 1972), which reinstates Arbuthnot's conversational cues. Although perhaps primarily intended for school and university readers within a culture whose dependence on the telephone as the main medium for communicating over a distance has effectively eliminated the <sup>refinements</sup> ~~fineries~~ of epistolary correspondence, Wimsatt's decision to emphasize Arbuthnot's verbal repartee may have some critical foundation.

Maynard Mack has uncovered some evidence which suggests that Pope may have instigated the change from an epistle to a dialogue as early as 1735.<sup>3</sup> Some of the annotations in Pope's presentation copy of Arbuthnot to the second Earl of Oxford, now in the Bodleian Library, may be in the poet's own hand. 'Publisht Janu. 2. 173<sup>4</sup>/<sub>5</sub>', this folio copy has been reproduced in facsimile by the Scolar Press.

<sup>3</sup> Maynard Mack, 'Some Annotations in the Second Earl of Oxford's Copies of Pope's Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot and Sober Advice from Horace', Review of English Studies, n.s., VIII (1957), 416-20; reprinted in Collected in Himself: essays critical, biographical and bibliographical on Pope and some of his contemporaries.

Mack acknowledges the difficulty of positively establishing whether some of the annotations in Oxford's copy of Arbuthnot are in Pope's hand, but he offers a convincing case for some lines scrawled at the bottom of page 11 - a defensive note explaining that the lines on Atticus were written before Addison's death in 1719. Craggs (who died in 1721) and Burlington were aware of this. Mack's argument that this note was written by Pope is strengthened by the fact that a similar version of it appears in the 1751 edition:

It was a great falshood, which some of the Libels reported, that this Character was written after the Gentleman's death; which see refuted in the Testimonies prefixed to the Dunciad. But the occasion of writing it was such as he would not make public out of regard to his memory: and all that could further be done was to omit the name, in the Edition of his Works. P.<sup>4</sup>

That Pope should put his hand to the newly dried ink of the 1735 folio is not surprising in Mack's view: 'it is perfectly plausible that Pope should have sent his friend, either by inadvertence or intent, a copy which he had already started to "correct" toward the new edition that was speedily to be published in his Works... Volume II, in April 1735' (418). Pope's obsessive revisions are well known, and 'speedily' is the appropriate word; the day

<sup>4</sup>Works IV (1751), 29n., ver 214.

[Pope's 'P'? Overleaf: An Epistle from Mr. Pope to  
Dr. Arbuthnot, 1734/35, Scholar Press facsimile (Menston,  
1970), p. 15 (reduced).]

before Arbuthnot was entered at Stationers' Hall - 1 January 1735 - Pope was apparently busy putting the final touches to his perfunctory 'Author to the Reader' for Works II. It is not difficult to imagine Pope dithering over what to write in Oxford's gift copy: at least two dozen words on page 11 are crossed out. Both Butt and Mack observe that Pope's note (above) was printed in the 1735 Works, so it is quite possible that Pope wrote a trial-run in the folio copy.<sup>5</sup>

Mack uses this likely possibility as a prop to support two other significant annotations: one on page 12 of the 1735 folio Arbuthnot consisting of a note and a couplet on Bufo; the other on page 15 consisting of three initial letters - 'P' and 'Dr' on line 294 and 'P' again at line 298 (see photocopy facing). Other marginalia throughout, including the note on Paris on page 15, Mack assumes, are in a different hand, presumably Oxford's.

Before 'Let Sporus tremble' in l. 305 [n.b. lines are misnumbered in 1735 folio], a capital 'P' has been inserted - also, I think, in Pope's hand - and before 'What?' in the same line, the word 'Dr', i.e. Arbuthnot. At the beginning of l. 309, where Pope again becomes the speaker after Arbuthnot's three and a half lines of protest, the 'P' is repeated. These are trifling alterations, yet interesting because they may show Pope commencing, in a limited way, and as yet only with the aim of perspicuity, the transformation of this epistle into dialogue, which Warburton, with or without authority, consummated in the edition of 1751 (418-19).

<sup>5</sup> See Twickenham IV, 111n. 214. Butt cites 1735ab, although the note on Atticus appears in neither the Scholar Press facsimile of Arbuthnot in 1735 Works II in folio nor in my copy of the quarto 1735 Works II.

Mack's opinion that Pope may have considered inserting dialogue markings throughout Arbuthnot is lent support in a recent review of his collected essays:

A study of annotations in the Earl of Oxford's copy of Epistle to Arbuthnot shows that the transformation of the poem into a dialogue, effected by Warburton in the 1751 edition, was almost certainly begun by Pope in 1735 and is therefore not, as has often been claimed, an editorial intrusion.<sup>6</sup>

But a re-examination of the manuscript evidence might suggest that Mack's findings are not as definite as they have been interpreted as being. (Note the growing certainty from Mack's cautious 'trifling alterations' which 'may show Pope commencing ... the transformation' to the above 'almost certainly begun by Pope'.)

Thanks to the astute selection of copies by David Foxon in the Scholar Press facsimile, we can peruse the folio in question without having to travel to the Bodleian to consult the original copy which Mack examined.<sup>7</sup> The difficulty in determining whether the 'P' and 'Dr' markings are in Pope's hand or someone else's is obvious at first glance. Both "P's" are noticeably slanted and curled with serifs on

<sup>6</sup> John Chalker, 'Seminal essays on Pope', Times Higher Educational Supplement (10 June 1983), p. 22 (review of Mack's essays, Collected in Himself). I am grateful to Professor Chalker for directing my attention towards Mack's article.

<sup>7</sup> An Epistle from Mr. Pope to Dr. Arbuthnot 1734 and Epistle VII to Dr. Arbuthnot from the Works, Volume II 1735, introduction by David Foxon, Scholar Press (Menston, 1970).



the bottom, as such: *p* . This is obviously unlike the 'M<sup>r</sup> P.' at the foot of page 11. However, the two page 15 "P's" have been styled in much the same way as the 'P' in 'Paris' on the same line at the end of line 294. As this annotation, as Mack points out, is not in Pope's hand, it is possible that the three dialogue markings are also not in Pope's hand. Mack's suggestion that Pope may have begun the alteration from epistle to dialogue (on the basis of these three markings) which Warburton completed in 1751 must, therefore, be regarded with the caution with which Mack presents his evidence.

If Pope did not insert the three dialogue markings, then who might have? Foxon tells us in his prefatory note to the Scholar Press facsimile of Arbuthnot, 'The copy of the separate edition reproduced here (Bodley M 3. 19 Art. 17) belonged to Pope's friend Edward Harley, second earl of Oxford, and bears his annotations.' The three markings might have served simply as an aid to remember who is addressing whom at this particular point in the text. Similarly, 'Tibbald', 'Welstead', and 'the Duke of Argile' have been written in the margin on page 3 to identify three figures:

Three things another's modest wishes bound,  
My Friendship, and a Prologue, and ten Pound.  
Pitholeon sends to me: "You know his Grace,  
"I want a Patron; ask him for a Place."

In the 'Paris' passage (which changes to 'Sporus' in the

1735 Works II) quotation marks have been set to tell the reader that someone else is speaking. The title of the poem tells the reader that the two principal voices belong to Pope and Arbuthnot, although Arbuthnot's lines are not always explicitly designated; yet Arbuthnot is a poem crowded with voices which Pope adopts or imitates to dramatize his epistle. Thus quotation marks are used throughout for different purposes. Pope's first use of them recalls his own words (inspired by Horace), '"Keep your Piece nine years."' The immediate reply to this is given without quotation marks: 'Nine years! cries he', yet four lines on, the desperate outcome is given in quotations:

"The Piece you think is incorrect? why take it,  
"I'm all submission, what you'd have it, make it."

Pope's use of quotation marks (or John Wright's) is somewhat idiosyncratic, hence confusing to the reader at times. Other voices inhabit Arbuthnot: Pitholeon's, the hand-greasing collaborator who whispers, '"Do, and we go snacks"', the mob's which roars, '"Subscribe, subscribe.'[sic]'. This last example is one of several of quotations which open but do not close. Thus the reader of the 1735 folio has a further confusion. On the page facing the 'Paris' passage is:

"I found him close with Swift—Indeed? no doubt  
(Cries prating Balbus) "something will come out."

The original reader might have blinked twice at this:  
 why are there no closing quotation marks after 'doubt'?  
Works II partially resolves this problem thus:

"I found him close with Swift—Indeed? no doubt  
 "(Cries prating Balbus) something will come out."

Both Butt and Davis render the couplet in two voices,  
 avoiding the ambiguous quotation before the parenthesis:

"I found him close with Swift"—"Indeed? no doubt"  
 (Cries prating Balbus) "something will come out."<sup>8</sup>

Given that Pope uses quotation marks on twenty-two occasions - and in seven instances the quotations open but do not close - it is not difficult to imagine a reader becoming bewildered by the use of voices towards the end of the poem. If Oxford were particularly interested in the Paris passage (as he seems to have been, judging by his note identifying Paris, later Sporus, as 'a more proper nickname' for Hervey), then it would seem plausible that Oxford inserted Pope's and the Doctor's initials. Mack's suggestion that Warburton may have had Pope's consent to transform Arbuthnot into a dialogue on the basis of these three annotations must be weighed against Butt's and Davis's editorial decisions to preserve the poem in its epistolary

<sup>8</sup>Twick. IV, 115, ll. 275-76. Note that Davis in the same passage does not italicize the names.

form.

Yet the question remains as to how Arbuthnot came to be changed into a dialogue. Was it a whim on Warburton's part or did Pope offer it as a suggestion when the two of them were preparing 'the Great Edition of my things with your Notes'? The reader should remember that Arbuthnot is an experiment in 'talking upon paper' which culminates in the razor-sharp repartee of Dialogue II in 1738:

F. Scandal! name them, Who?  
 P. Why that's the thing you bid me not to do.  
 Who starv'd a Sister, who forswore a Debt,  
 I never nam'd—the Town's enquiring yet.  
 The pois'ning Dame—Fr. You mean—P. I don't.—Fr.  
 You do.  
 P. See! now I keep the Secret, and not you.

Satire II i, published less than a year before Arbuthnot, attests to Pope's pre-occupation with the dialogue form, and this first Horatian imitation 'writ in two mornings' (as Pope told Swift) no doubt affected the genesis of Arbuthnot. John M. Aden makes a case for Arbuthnot's dialogue format in his discussion of Pope's use of the adversarius:

I include the Epistle to Arbuthnot among the poems employing an adversary because, even though as originally published no adversary was identified, I believe a case can be made for Warburton's procedure in giving some of the speeches to Arbuthnot. . . . Normally, it is true, the epistle, as a form, does not employ an interlocutor, that presumably being a contradiction in terms. . . . None of Horace's Epistles

admits a participating adversary, though they often create, within the framework of the epistle, what I have called a nonce adversary, for the purpose of rhetorical question and answer. In Pope such a nonce adversary is very common, and what no doubt began as such in Pope's original wrestling with the poem may have given way to the introduction of his correspondent as, in effect, a present or participating adversary. What more likely happened is that Pope felt the attraction of both forms, the epistle and the dialogue, and admitted a confusion of form into his poem. Not that the result is damaging, for I cannot agree with Professor Butt that the shift to dialogue is "a change for the worse," though it admittedly introduces a contradiction in technical point of view that is somewhat troublesome. Theoretically, an epistle, being a monologue, cannot be a dialogue. The fact remains that Pope seems to have made it not only possible, but successful.<sup>9</sup>

In support of his argument, Aden cites Robert W. Rogers's account in his Major Satires of Alexander Pope which 'traces in detail the piecemeal career of the poem's composition, from which it becomes clear that there is a sufficient confusion surrounding the origins, manuscripts, and texts of the poem to warrant an open mind on the subject of the form.'<sup>10</sup> As theoretically compelling as Aden's case sounds, it by no means refutes Butt's editorial argument for presenting Arbuthnot as an epistle; an 'open' verdict is of little use when only one text is to be printed.

<sup>9</sup> John M. Aden, 'Pope and the Satiric Adversary', in Essential Articles, edited by Maynard Mack (Hamden, Conn., 1964), pp. 569-590 (pp. 577-78). See also his Something Like Horace (Nashville, 1969), p. 14 and n.

<sup>10</sup> Aden, p. 588, n.11; Rogers, Major Satires of Alexander Pope (Urbana, Ill., 1959), pp. 70-71.

Warburton's transformation of the Epistle to Bathurst into a dialogue has never been critically vindicated, yet its parallels to the presentation of Arbuthnot are obvious. Short of any verbal alterations, as Bateson maintains, Warburton 'felt himself at liberty to do anything he liked'. This included fiddling with titles and format:

In the 1751 edition To Bathurst becomes an imaginary conversation between Pope and Lord Bathurst, a transformation effected without changing a word, simply by prefixing "P." (=Pope) to most of the poem, with "B." (=Bathurst) occasionally interjecting a few lines. As in the case of the Epistle to Arbuthnot, where Warburton made a similar change, the dramatic and colloquial nature of Pope's verse made the transformation from the letter-form into a dialogue easy and plausible. But,<sup>11</sup> of course, there is really no excuse for it.

As Arbuthnot barely lived to see the first edition of his Epistle, we can only guess at what his reaction to Warburton's 1751 text might have been, but it might not have been altogether different from Bathurst's opinion of his own converted Epistle, as related by Joseph Warton:

"That very lively and amiable old nobleman, the Lord BATHURST, told me... that he was much surprised to see what he had with repeated pleasure so often read as an epistle addressed to himself, in this edition converted into a dialogue; in which', said he, 'I perceive I really make but a shabby and indifferent

<sup>11</sup>Twick. III.ii, xv.



figure, and contribute very little to the spirit of the dialogue, if it must be a dialogue; and I hope I had generally more to say for myself in the many charming conversations I used to hold with POPE and Swift, and my old poetical friends.'"12

The indignation of the dedicatee, as Bateson points out, at finding a poem-letter which formerly honoured him in its entirety but later reduced him to a minor speaking part is understandable. The subtle alteration in the Warburton edition gives the impression that Pope 'lent out' his complimentary epistles and later retrieved them to compliment himself as a scintillating, hence dominating, conversationalist. No wonder Bathurst 'repeatedly expressed his disgust' at Warburton's text: between Buckingham's death scene and the concluding Balaam passage, Bathurst is given one word. Warburton's splicing at line 338 was censured:

"And I [Warton] remember he [Bathurst] once remarked, 'that this line,  
P. But you are tir'd. I'll tell a tale. B. Agreed;—  
was insupportably insipid and flat.'"13

Rendered in dialogue form, the Epistle to Bathurst portrays its dedicatee as someone who is nodding off in the background and Pope as an unflagging raconteur in love with the sound of his own voice. Although self-parody is a vital element of both epistles to Bathurst and Arbuthnot, it is given a

<sup>12</sup>Twick. III.ii, 79.

<sup>13</sup>Twick. III.ii, 120-21, n. 338.

sharper inflection than Pope originally intended.

There is no textual authority for Warburton's alteration of Bathurst from an epistle to a dialogue; Bateson's bibliographical examination of the 1744 'death-bed' quarto edition of Epistles to Several Persons makes this abundantly clear. The question of whether Warburton's change enhances or corrupts Pope's text will continue to be hotly debated by scholarly editors and their more 'open'-minded counterparts. Unless Warburton's copy-text with Pope's authorized annotations is found - and it is unlikely as we approach Pope's tercentenary that such definitive evidence will turn up - the question will remain a minor variation of the ancient versus modern debate: 1744 or 1751? Recent popular British editions - the Penguin Pope edited by Douglas Grant (1970) and the Everyman revised by Clive T. Probyn (1983) - accept, implicitly or otherwise, Warburton's text. This might suggest one of Warburton's motives for the alterations from epistle to dialogue; by imposing his editorial judgment on Bathurst and Arbuthnot he may have appealed to a broader market, offering potential buyers something 'new', at least newer than previous editions. Controversy, one of Warburton's undoubted fortes, might help generate sales, and even in a relatively minimal aspect - Warburton's mode of presentation as opposed to Pope's canon - a change might have been seen as an improvement.

....

[Overleaf: WARBURTON'S CANCELLED PAGE/THE PAGE AS PUBLISHED,  
with sour note on 'Mallock', from Elwin-Courthope edition of  
Pope's Works, III (1881), 534-35.]

### Arbuthnot and the Problem of Arrangement

How then are we to consider Arbuthnot? Is it (apart from being either an epistle or a dialogue or both) meant to be read as an independent poem or a prologue to Pope's satires? What is its canonical relationship to the rest of Pope's poems? How does it fit?

The two opening pages opposite<sup>1</sup> shed some light on the origin of the editorial confusion which has dogged Arbuthnot since Pope's death. 'WARBURTON'S CANCELLED PAGE' (the lower one; p. 534) would suggest that the editor had at one stage (perhaps not long after the publication of A Familiar Epistle to the most Impudent Man Living in 1749) planned to attack David Mallet (or Mallock) in a footnote on the opening page (\*B5) of Arbuthnot. He later decided, perhaps on the advice of Lyttelton (who had previously mediated between Warburton and Bolingbroke),<sup>2</sup> it would have been too undiplomatic to revive old hostilities. Hence: 'THE PAGE AS PUBLISHED.'

Perhaps the worst feature of Warburton's cancelled page is the variation which the editor would have his reader believe was the product of Pope's imagination: 'And now vile Poets rise before the light/And walk, like Marg'ret's Ghost,

<sup>1</sup>Pope, Works, edited by Whitwell Elwin and William John Courthope, 10 vols (London, 1872-89), III (1881), 534-35 [hereafter 'E/C']. How Courthope discovered Warburton's cancelled page and what became of it, I have yet to find out. 'THE PAGE AS PUBLISHED' does not exactly match the same page in the McMaster copy: the E/C page is reset, has a slightly larger frame, and lacks the line number (5).

<sup>2</sup>Kilvert, Unpublished Papers, pp. 207-08 (2 September 1745); see Appendix A.

at dead of night'.<sup>3</sup> If, as seems likely, Warburton himself composed this couplet in order that he might claim some manuscript authority for his Scriblerian footnote, then he is committing the most grievous editorial sin, that of deliberately fabricating his own text. Had this footnote been published, Warburton might well have been exposed; after all, Bolingbroke and Marchmont had control over Pope's manuscripts, and Warburton could have been called upon to submit his 'proof'. Warburton may have been willing to trump up charges (as well as bad couplets) seemingly under Pope's auspices for the sake of maligning a man whom Pope had once befriended, but even he had to draw the line at forged evidence.<sup>4</sup>

Courthope introduced the two Arbuthnot openings with a note explaining that Warburton 'had to supply the hiatus in the page, left by the removal of the note, [so] he invented the title Prologue to the Satires'.<sup>5</sup> From this, Courthope concluded that Warburton had also fabricated the 'Epilogue to the Satires' label to tidy up the arrangement. Although this deduction was erroneous - Pope oversaw the 'Epilogue to the Satires' change in the 1740 Works II ii<sup>6</sup> -

<sup>3</sup>Courthope assumes Pope wrote this couplet, although it seems unlikely. There is no mention in Twickenham.

<sup>4</sup>Might Warburton have regarded Mallet as a potential rival to the Pope editorship? Mallet may have edited Algernon Sidney's letters in 1742 (Corr., III, 328n.)

<sup>5</sup>E/C, III, 533.

<sup>6</sup>Twickenham, IV, 94n.

the cancelled Arbuthnot page is worth reconsidering in light of the apparent differences in modern editions.

Shall we go back to the beginning? If we were passing by Lawton Gilliver's shop at Homer's Head in Fleet Street on the second of January, 1735, the title-page everyone would have been elbowing to see in the window would have read: An Epistle from Mr. Pope, to Dr. Arbuthnot. By April, the same poem (with a number of slight changes) appeared in the second volume of Pope's Works at the end of a section entitled, Ethic Epistles. The Second Book. To Several Persons, and its title now read: Epistle VII. To Dr. Arbuthnot. The arrangement of this section, which follows the Essay on Man (the first book of Ethic Epistles), is chronologically haphazard: the first four epistles to several persons were written (and re-ordered) in the early 1730s, while epistles V, To Addison, and VI, To Oxford, had been published a decade before. Arbuthnot itself was written at various times and had even been intended at one stage for William Cleland.<sup>7</sup> Pope was, in 1735, hoping to marshal disparate parts into one unified philosophical vision - an 'opus magnum'. This ambition would eventually be shelved and abandoned.

The last appearance of Arbuthnot in printed form during Pope's lifetime was in Works II i, printed for R. Dodsley

<sup>7</sup>See John Butt's trans-American bibliographical detective work, piecing together the Pierpont Morgan and Huntington Library drafts of Arbuthnot in 'Pope's Poetical Manuscripts', in Essential Articles, edited by Maynard Mack (Hamden, Conn., 1964), pp. 507-27; 522-24.



and sold by T. Cooper, in 1743. In this collection Arbuthnot came last out of eleven Epistles to Several Persons. Preceding this sprawling group of poems were the four epistles making up the Essay on Man. At the end of this volume, on page 181, was printed the note:

N.B. Those Satires and Epistles of Horace, with the Satires of Dr. Donne, hitherto printed in this Volume, are in this new Edition placed at the beginning of the Second Part, in their proper Order with others of the same kind by the Author, which compleat his Poetical Works.<sup>8</sup>

At this stage - Pope's last published arrangement of the poem - Arbuthnot seems to be more of an end-piece than a prologue; and the above note on the 'proper Order' of the Horatian and Donnian satires - in a separate volume - suggests a determination to keep Arbuthnot apart from his Imitations.

Although there is no proof in their correspondence that Warburton had Pope's consent in making Arbuthnot into a prologue, it may have been one of the many unrecorded alterations that was agreed upon in private discussion during the last few months of Pope's life. On the other hand, Warburton may have acted on his own initiative in this instance as he did elsewhere (e.g. he prefaced the Essay

<sup>8</sup>Pope, Works, II, i (1743), 181. (Griffith 583) After Arbuthnot come some of Pope's epitaphs and the Universal Prayer. The imitations of Horace and Donne are printed in Works II ii (1743); this volume contains Sober Advice.

on Man in the third volume with John Brown's Essay on Satire which had been revised to highlight Warburton's importance in an unctuous manner). However it is unlikely that any documented nod of approval from Pope will appear.<sup>9</sup> Warburton deleted the following when he printed Pope's letter of 12 January 1744:

determining to finish the Epistles to Dr Arb. & 2 or 3 of the best of Horace, particularly that to Augustus, first, which will all fall into the same vol. with the Essay on Man.<sup>10</sup>

Fifteen days later, Pope wrote, 'I wish next for your Remarks, on that to Dr Arbuthnot, (which will hold, I believe, of something between a Commentary & Notes, something of the General Conduct of the piece, the Transitions &c, & something more as to particular & separate passages.) These I propose to print next together.'<sup>11</sup> From this, we might gather that Pope's last illness cut short plans to restructure the Essay on Man volume and revision of Warburton's commentary.

At least one contemporary critic, Dr Johnson, appears to have taken exception to Warburton's editorial decision:

<sup>9</sup>If Knapton's correspondence to Warburton is still in existence, there might be a reference to the arrangement.

<sup>10</sup>Correspondence, IV, 491.

<sup>11</sup>Correspondence, IV, 495.

he refers to 'The Epistle to Arbuthnot, now arbitrarily called the Prologue to the Satires'.<sup>12</sup> If we jump back to the 'Author to the Reader' prefacing the 1735 Works, Pope singles out Arbuthnot as an end-piece: 'All I had to say of my Writings is contained in my Preface to the first of these Volumes. . . all I have to say of Myself will be found in my last Epistle'.<sup>13</sup> From first to last arrangement within Pope's lifetime, Arbuthnot, with its retrospective meditations on a fiery poetic career, occupies an end position.

It will be obvious to anyone that Arbuthnot would still have been regarded as a prologue if the cancelled page had been allowed to stand. Before the change Arbuthnot was already placed immediately before the Horatian imitations. In the Advertisement (vol. I) Warburton tells us, 'The FOURTH Volume contains the Satires; with their Prologue, the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot',<sup>14</sup> so if the conversion came late in the production of the Works, at least there was time to update the overall scheme of the edition as well as the contents page of the fourth volume. One small detail was overlooked (or not considered important enough to warrant further cancellations): as the two Elwin-Courthope pages

<sup>12</sup>Johnson, Lives of the Poets, III, 246.

<sup>13</sup>Pope, Works (1735), aI (no pagination).

<sup>14</sup>Pope, Works (1751), I, vii.

partly show, the running-title throughout the 1751 text reads: 'EPISTLE / TO DR. ARBUTHNOT'. This was changed in the 1751b edition, the 1752 and subsequent editions to: 'PROLOGUE / TO THE SATIRES', which might suggest Warburton was subtly refortifying his own conversion. (At this point we might reflect upon the notion that editorial intention may be as complex an issue - or as big a fallacy - as its authorial counterpart.)

Yet the question of whether Arbuthnot ought to be regarded as an introductory poem or a separate piece is brought to our attention by modern editions of Pope's works. The following chart indicates the canonical complexities:

WARBURTON WORKS IV 1751	BUTT TWICK. IV 1939	BUTT TWICK. 1-VOL. 1963	DAVIS OXFORD 1966
Arbuthnot	Sat. II i	<u>Arbuthnot</u>	Arbuthnot
Satire II i	Donne IV	Sat. II i	Sat. II i
Satire II ii	Sat. II ii	Sat. II ii	Sat. II ii
Epistle I i	Sober Advice	Ep. I i	Ep. I i
Epistle I vi	Arbuthnot	Ep. I vi	Ep. I vi
Epistle II i	Donne II	Ep. II i	Ep. II i
Epistle II ii	Ode IV i	Ep. II ii	Ep. II ii
Donne III	Ode IV ix	Satire II vi	Ep. I vii
Donne II	Ep. II ii	Ep. I vii	Sat. II vi
Donne IV	Ep. II i	Sober Advice	Ode IV i
Dialogue I	Ep. I vi	Ode IV i	Ode IV ix
Dialogue II	Sat. II vi	Ode IV ix	Sober Advice*
Lady Shirley	Ep. I vii	Donne II	Donne II
	Ep. I i	Donne IV	Donne IV
	Dia. I	Dia. I	Dia. I
	Dia. II	Dia. II	Dia. II
	1740	Lady Shirley	(*Sat. I ii)

Apart from including Arbuthnot, Donne III (by Parnell), and Lady Shirley - and excluding Satire II vi, Epistle I vii, and Satire I ii (Sober Advice from Horace) - Warburton's 1751 arrangement follows the pattern of Works II ii which Pope set in 1743. We might well question the insertion of Parnell's Donne III, especially as Warburton admits it is one he wished Pope might have polished (and he includes it to show how better Pope's versifications are by comparison). We might also wonder why Warburton chose to put the Lady Shirley poem - albeit brief and mock-heroically charming - after the Epilogue (which completed, as an epilogue should, Works II ii).<sup>15</sup>

Warburton's arrangement was more or less followed by Warton (1797), Carruthers (1853), and Courthope (1881). Warton reinstated Sober Advice in the Pope canon, although not in the same volume as the other main Horatian imitations; and Courthope, who curiously reversed the order of Epistles I i (to Bolingbroke) and I vi (to Murray), continued to expand the canon, yet omitted Sober Advice. What is even more curious is that Courthope, having reproduced Warburton's cancelled page in order to expose Warburton's editorial machination, perpetuates the 'Prologue to the Satires' designation in both his half-title and his running-titles.

As our chart shows, John Butt decided not to follow

<sup>15</sup> If you remove Ode IV i, Ode IV ix, and Lady Shirley from the third column of the chart (BUTT/TWICK. 1-VOL./1965), you will have the 1743 Works II ii arrangement with all contents in the same order.

Warburton's long-established arrangement. As the general editor of the Twickenham series, Butt decided:

In the disposal of the poems it has been found advisable to depart from the arrangement which has been traditional since Warburton's first edition of 1751, in order to avoid discrepancy in the size of the volumes and in the importance of their contents.<sup>16</sup>

Butt's edition of the Imitations of Horace represents a bold departure: he orders the poems chronologically (on the basis of when they were published, not composed), so, for example, Donne IV, 'whose publication intervened between the two Imitations [Satires II i and II ii]',<sup>17</sup> comes before Donne II (which was written much earlier, about 1713). In its application to Pope's growing concern over the political situation in the 1730s and the decision to release given satires at certain times, Butt's arrangement is ideal. He amply substantiates his case for chronological arrangement with contemporary historical evidence. For the reader who wants to follow a satirist's random commentary of a much troubled decade, this edition offers the most orderly possibility.

Arbuthnot comes fifth in the 1939 Twickenham arrangement,

<sup>16</sup> Twickenham IV, vii.

<sup>17</sup> Twickenham IV, xxxvii.



Satire II i, which was published in 1733, now usurping its introductory position. Butt cites Courthope's note on the cancelled page and Warburton's subsequent elongation of the title in his note on the text. Although he restores the title to its original simplicity (omitting the 'Prologue' phrase), Butt points out:

The new addition to the title is implied in the new position which the poem occupies. Even if Pope did not authorize this there can be little objection to it, for the poem is the most Horatian of Pope's original works, and its immediate occasion was the Verses to an Imitator of Horace.<sup>18</sup>

Even though Butt agrees with Arbuthnot's inclusion in the volume of Horatian imitations, he obviously disputes the poem's 'Prologue' status.<sup>19</sup>

However, when it came time to prepare the one-volume Twickenham edition of 1963 - an edition which was intended more for the broader range of students than the narrower circle of eighteenth-century specialists - Butt decided to alter his editorial stance: 'The order adopted for this volume preserves some features of Pope's categories, yet does not depart so far from chronological order as to mis-

<sup>18</sup>Twickenham IV, 94.

<sup>19</sup>In the Methuen's English Classics series there are separate editions for Arbuthnot (1954; rpt. 1965) and Imitations of Horace (1966), both edited by John Butt. Thus, in schools, the two titles are considered independently. On the other hand, the Oxford school edition of Pope's Horatian Satires and Epistles, edited by H.H. Erskine-Hill (1964), includes Arbuthnot as the 'Prologue'.

lead the reader and to destroy all sense of a developing career.'<sup>20</sup> In this edition Butt places Arbuthnot immediately before - yet outside the context of - the Imitations of Horace. While both appear under the same general category, 'Poems: 1730-1744', they are listed separately in the contents. The arrangement of the Horatian imitations reverts to the 1743 Works II ii order, apart from adding the two odes and the bread-and-butter poem to Lady Shirley.

With the Oxford Standard Authors Poetical Works (1966), edited by Herbert Davis, we are presented with another alternative or, rather, a refurbished Warburtonian order. Thus, the modern student of Pope is offered three choices in three 'definitive' editions: the chronological arrangement (which scrambles the<sup>numerical</sup> order of the Horatian and Donnian canon); Arbuthnot and the Horatian imitations as separate works (but, nonetheless, in close proximity); and finally Arbuthnot, as Warburton presented it, 'Being the Prologue to the Satires'.

Herbert Davis's main editorial principle has been 'to provide a text which attempts to follow his [Pope's] latest wishes both in substance and in accidentals', although he admits:

The problem of arrangement is difficult.  
I have been tempted, like many earlier editors,

<sup>20</sup>Twickenham, one-vol., edited by John Butt (1963; rpt. 1977), vii.

to try and preserve something of Pope's own plan in the volumes of his Collected Works. This method has at least one advantage in showing what Pope himself had collected together at different times, and what has been added to the canon subsequently.<sup>21</sup>

Davis acknowledges Butt's assistance in preparing his own edition. 'Though the text printed here will be found to differ from a large part of the Twickenham text in accidents, it will differ in substance hardly at all.' He concludes, 'It is my modest hope that it may demonstrate that there are more ways than one of editing texts printed in the eighteenth century.' The situation is not entirely unlike that in eighteenth-century editing where one might find two eminent scholars who place different emphases on the same text. How, for example, would a reader decide which play was a tragedy and which a comedy when equally respectable editors chose to assign the play to opposed categories?

With Arbuthnot the case is not so extreme. We read the poem differently at different times. Read on its own it seems a ~~highly~~ profound personal statement; read in context it has obvious affinities with Satire II i and might easily be regarded as the precursor of the two Dialogues. The poetical self-analysis of 'Why did I write?' in Arbuthnot

<sup>21</sup>Poetical Works, edited by Herbert Davis (1966), vi.

(l. 125) is pursued in Satire II i which resolves the dilemma - using the adversarius; a friend to fight against - in assertive capitals: 'TO VIRTUE ONLY and HER FRIENDS, A FRIEND' (l. 121). Yet we must be careful not to confuse Pope's Horatian persona with his own. The Arbuthnot poet 'Can sleep without a Poem in my head' (l. 269), but not so the insomniac satirist of II i:

I nod in Company, I wake at Night,  
Fools rush into my Head, and so I write. (ll. 13-14)

Nonetheless, the 'Wits and Templars' in Arbuthnot (l. 211) are cognate with those crowding the first couplet of Sober Advice.

The Horatian imitations in their various pursuits, attempting to escape from everyday chaos to a temporary haven of poetic order, do not present us with a unified structure in the way that the Essay on Man aspires to do. The reader following the strands of satire from the surviving iambics of Archilochus, through the mixed forms of Horace, Petronius and Juvenal, up to Utopia and Gulliver's Travels, expects fragments, not tapestries. Arbuthnot's genesis (see Butt's research on 'Pope's Poetical Manuscripts') was a long and difficult one; yet Pope was possessed of the rare ability of not only carrying out his initial inspirations to the full, but also of threatening a perfect piece with revising and actually making it better. As the maker of individual poems

he was unsurpassable in his time, but as a builder of his opus magnum he was destined to be disappointed. Warburton's addition of the 'Prologue' title, as Butt suggests, may have been more than simply a stop-gap to fill the hiatus left when the Mallet note was removed. It seems unlikely, at any rate, that Warburton was afraid that his sneering remarks might get back to Mallet. Mason repeated the remark, 'when he composed the life of Lord Verulam, he forgot that he was a Philosopher; and therefore, it was to be feared, should he finish that of the Duke of Marlborough, he would forget that he was a General', in his memoir of Gray.<sup>22</sup> Boswell gave this criticism greater currency when he heard it spoken, 'with witty justness', by Dr Johnson.<sup>23</sup> If, as seems more likely, Warburton deleted the note because he could not prove Pope wrote the satirical couplet about Mallet's 'Marg'ret's Ghost', then perhaps he struck upon the 'Prologue' idea (which was already self-evident from his arrangement of the canon). It would, after all, be less difficult to prove Pope didn't wish his Horatian imitations to be regarded as a unified development of his satiric imagination.

Shall we revise the opening question: given the three choices outlined above, which one (if we were put in the

<sup>22</sup>Poems of Gray, edited by William Mason (York, 1775), 'Memoir of Gray', p. 2.

<sup>23</sup>Boswell's Life of Johnson, III, 194 (22 September 1777).

editor's chair and forced to pick) would go in the Tercentenary Edition of Pope's Works? The question is not so remote as it seems (and much less remote than when this section was originally drafted). Dr Johnson, as we have seen, thought the 'Prologue' innovation questionable; yet it seemed to bother few other contemporary readers. Few readers today would concern themselves over this bibliographical chicken-or-egg quandary: which came first? The important thing, however, is the way in which scholars perceive relationships between poems. A novice Pope reader might easily be misled by Martin Price's Signet arrangement which gives the 'Prologue' title over the 1735 date. Arbuthnot and Satire II i seem rhetorically complementary, but did the quick inspiration to write the latter act as a catalyst for the former, more troublesome poem? Or, as Butt originally decided, are the thematic developments too problematic to make anything other than a chronological arrangement feasible?

I would tend towards Butt's later decision - having used Twickenham IV quite frequently over the past five years, I must admit to a niggling uncertainty over the ordering of its contents. Converting from one edition to another is difficult; if one were to connect the titles of the poems given in the above chart, it would resemble a spaghetti junction. This, of course, is no reason to reject Butt's original arrangement, although he implicitly



abandoned the chronological order in both the one-volume Twickenham and the Methuen's English Classics editions. This narrows our choice down to two. In his introduction to the revised Oxford Standard Authors edition, Pat Rogers pauses briefly to reconsider Herbert Davis's decision: 'When these Horatian poems were collected by Warburton in 1751 the famous Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot was set at their head, and a subtitle 'Prologue to the Satires' appended. We cannot be sure that this would have had Pope's blessing, but all in all it makes reasonable sense.'<sup>24</sup> Still, I would be more inclined to accept Butt's judgement (based on the 1743 Works II i and ii arrangement whereby Pope separated Arbuthnot from the Imitations of Horace) rather than Davis's decision (based on Warburton's somewhat shaky order).

The two arrangements are not necessarily opposed, yet they pose a not inconsiderable problem for future editors to unravel. There is merit in either case. Having a choice of arrangements compels the reader to examine Arbuthnot in the larger context of the Horatian imitations. In spite of its Horatian affinities (or because of its unusual evolution in Pope's career), I think it ought to stand, as Pope wanted it in 1735, as an address to his old and close friend, a doctor able 'To help me thro' this long Disease, my Life'. Arbuthnot stands eminent in its own right.

<sup>24</sup>Pope, Poetical Works, edited by Herbert Davis, revised with an introduction by Pat Rogers (Oxford, 1966; rpt. 1978), xxi. I am grateful to Dr Michael Phillips for sharing his research on the composition of Satire II i with me.

52 IMITATIONS Book II.

# SATIRA PRIMA.

HORATIUS. TREBATIUS.

HORATIUS.

**S**UNT quibus in Satira videtur nimis acer, et ultra Legem tendere opus; <sup>b</sup> sine nervis altera, quidquid Composui, pars esse putat, firmisque meorum Mille die versus deduci posse. <sup>c</sup> Trebati, Quid faciam? praescribe.

T. <sup>d</sup> Quiescas.

H. Ne faciam, inquis,

Omnino versus?

T. Aio.

H. Peream male, si non

Optimum erat; <sup>e</sup> verum nequeo dormire.

NOTES.

VER. 3. *Scarce to wile* Peter — [Chartres] It has been commonly observed of the English, that a Rogue never goes to the Gallows without the pity of the Spectators, and their parting curses on the rigour of the Laws that brought him thither: and this has been as commonly ascribed to the *good nature* of the people. But it is a mistake. The true cause is their hatred and envy of power. Their compassion for Dunces and Scoundrels (when exposed by great writers to public contempt, either in justice to the age, or in vindication of their own Characters) has the same source. They cover their envy to a superior genius, in lamenting the severity of his Pen.

Sat. I. OF HORACE. 53

# SATIRE I.

TO MR. FORTESCUE.

**T**HERE are (I scarce can think it, but am told)

<sup>a</sup> There are, to whom my Satire seems too bold: — Scarce to wile Peter complaisant enough,

And something said of Chartres much too rough.

<sup>b</sup> The lines are weak, another's pleas'd to say, Lord Fanny spins a thousand such a day.

Tim'rous by nature, of the Rich in awe,

<sup>c</sup> I come to Council learned in the Law:

You'll give me, like a friend both sage and free,

Advice; and (as you use) without a Fee. 10

F. <sup>d</sup> I'd write no more.

P. Not write? but then I think,

<sup>e</sup> And for my soul I cannot sleep a wink.

NOTES.

VER. 7. *Tim'rous by nature, of the Rich in awe,*] The delicacy of this does not so much lie in the ironical application of it to himself, as in its seriously characterising the Person for whose advice he applies.

VER. 12. *Not write? &c.*] He has omitted the most humorous part of the answer,

*Peream male, si non*

*Optimum erat,*

and has lost the grace, by not imitating the conciseness, of *verum nequeo dormire.*

\* E 3

Relocation of Plate XVII in 1751 Works IV

Another late change in the fourth volume of the 1751 large octavo edition of Pope's Works was the shifting of plate XVII from its original location 'facing p. 99' to its more permanent place 'facing p. 53'.<sup>1</sup> Although this change has not had the far-reaching effects of the cancellation of the original leaf \*B5 (which resulted in the conversion of Arbuthnot into a 'Prologue'), it is worth noting as a bibliographical idiosyncrasy as well as an editorial decision which might not have met with Pope's approval.<sup>2</sup>

Plate XVII originally faced the half-title of The First Epistle of the First Book of Horace (\*H2r), spaced well apart from the two other plates in the volume; all three were designed by Francis Hayman and engraved by Charles Grignion. This correct designation, 'facing p. 99', is followed out in two of the eight 1751 large octavo editions I have examined for this study.<sup>3</sup> At some stage of final production (the only plate which is dated appears in the third volume facing page 39, designed by Nicholas

<sup>1</sup>An earlier version of this section was published in Notes and Queries, n.s., vol. 30, no. 1 (February 1983), 34-35.

<sup>2</sup>Gaskell sets out the method for description of plates in technical notes in his New Introduction to Bibliography (Oxford, 1972), p. 334. Griffith occasionally gives details about plates, although he does not mention this plate.

<sup>3</sup>Copies which have plate XVII facing the half-title of Epistle I i are to be found in the Bodleian (12 0 1264) and the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto (B-11 3775).

Blakey in 1748) the direction to the person doing the pasting in was altered to 'facing p. 53'. The plate was accordingly relocated so that it faced the opening lines of Satire II i (on \*E3r). As I shall argue shortly, this was a change for the worse.

The plate itself shows a Palladian tableau with Mercury and Apollo offering up the works of Donne and Horace respectively to Pope who is musing at his table, writing instrument in hand, books and Bounce at his feet. Below, the inscription, 'Safe from the Bar, the Pulpit and the Throne,/Yet touch'd and sham'd by Ridicule alone', is taken from the Epilogue to the Satires (Dialogue II, 210-11); although this couplet has been taken from the last of the Imitations, its matter is certainly germane to the theme of Pope's first translation from Horace which begins in artistic self-doubt and ends in triumphant resolution. Thus, as it stands, plate XVII is ideally intended to re-create the moment of Pope's first impulse to write his imitations. Under the combined spell of the gods of energy and the poets of satiric tradition, Pope transcends domestic chaos and lifts his quill from the sable well. In spite of the artist's omission of the poet's ink, the plate itself is an appropriate image on which to begin reading Pope's imitations of Horace and Donne, a fit accompaniment to the genesis of satire.

In shifting plate XVII to its new location, some plates

bearing the original direction, 'facing p. 99', were inserted in the new location (facing page 53).<sup>4</sup> Rather than waste perfectly good plates with superseded numbers, the binder (or whoever was given the job of pasting-in) saw fit to use up the remainder of the earlier batch. Instructions for this new arrangement must have come from Warburton himself; possibly he decided to shift the plate at the same time he chose to delete the derogatory note on Mallet. As he was resident for most of the year at Prior Park, Warburton may not have been aware that old plates were being used in the new location; or perhaps Knapton wanted to economize wherever possible on an edition which was proving increasingly expensive to produce. Warburton's cancellations were not only raising printing costs - Bowyer's<sup>7</sup><sup>outstanding</sup> bill would be a substantial factor in the failing of the Knapton business - they were delaying the release date. The edition was eventually published in early June 1751, a time of year when many potential buyers would be planning their rambles, not purchasing large editions. The superseded plates may have been pasted in accidentally or perhaps they were inserted while the new page number was being engraved and the new plates made. Whatever the origin of the idiosyncrasy, the new arrangement stood: plate XVII faces the opening lines of

<sup>4</sup>Copies which have plate XVII printed 'facing p. 99' but which, in fact, face page 53 may be found in the British Library (G.12853), the National Library of Scotland (Ak. 7/2. 18), and in a private collection.

Satire II i in the large octavo 1752 edition (again \*E3r) as well as the small octavo 1751 edition (with a different collation) and subsequent Warburton editions.<sup>5</sup>

The editorial decision to move plate XVII has resulted in interference rather than improvement. Pope originally intended that his imitation be read alongside its Latin original. Where Pope wanted his readers to note a particular Latin-English parallel, he marked the twin passages with numerals. To facilitate the bilingual reading of Satire II i, Pope, in the first folio edition of 1733, had the shorter text of Horace's Latin staggered in such a way that marked passages were directly opposite one another. To adapt an image from Donne - 'If they be two, they are two so/As stiff twin compasses are two;' - Pope's English lines ought ideally to come home to Horace's Latin when the book shuts. Every measure was taken by Pope for the reader's convenience in transliteral reading.

Thus Warburton, in relocating plate XVII, places an unnecessary barrier between Latin and English texts. Although this happens only once in the volume, it happens in a crucial juncture - between the opening leaves of the first Imitation of Horace. Pope might have criticized Warburton on this account: the editor has moved a plate from a satisfactory location to one which does Pope's text least justice.

<sup>5</sup> Copies which have plate XVII printed 'facing p. 53' and have been pasted in accordingly may be found at the BL (685.e.4), Columbia University (B82 4 P81), and Mills Memorial Library, McMaster University (Rare Books 5461).



Conclusion: W----s & Editorial Liberty

It may come as no great surprise that the man who so ruthlessly satirized Warburton in the Essay on Woman at one time (perhaps a dozen years earlier) thought if Warburton was so ill-suited to the job of editing Pope he would do <sup>it</sup>so himself. The time for unmasking (or hiatus-filling) is at hand: our contemporary buyer of the 1751 edition, one W----s, is none other than John Wilkes.<sup>1</sup>

Wilkes had his set of the Warburton Pope specially bound with extra leaves for addenda. An anonymous, handwritten note on the fly-leaf at the front of the first volume reads: 'This copy belonged to John Wilkes Esq<sup>r</sup> the Mss. notes and additions are by him. he had intended to publish an edition of Pope.' In 1751 Wilkes, having been to Leyden, had been married in his early twenties to a woman ten years his senior and was the father of Polly, now a year old. It is unlikely the man about to embark on a wild excursion with his Medmenham Abbey cronies would have found time or temperament to edit Pope's works. Perhaps Wilkes began collecting his material for the edition which never appeared at a later stage in his career.

The Jonathan Richardson engraving of Pope in 1738 has been pasted in; Wilkes would certainly have thrown out War-

<sup>1</sup>The Wilkes set of the 1751 Works is in the British Library (G.12850-8). Butt refers to this large octavo edition in Twickenham IV, ix, 307n.

burton's frontispiece (although it is unlikely he would have substituted it with one by Hogarth). Beneath Wilkes's pasted-in frontispiece is the Arthur Pond medallion of Pope similar to the one which appears in the small octavo editions of the Essay on Man.<sup>2</sup> Opposite the opening page of Warburton's Advertisement, a motto in French verse - 'Horace avec Boileau' - has been written by Wilkes or his amanuensis, with a description of Pope's bust designed by Kent below. Nothing has been written in the margins of Warburton's Advertisement, but on the contents page has been added the last piece in the volume, Pope's 'Epilogue to Mr Rowe's Jane Shore' on page 272.

Various allusions are noted throughout the first volume:

Waller's 'The Maid's Tragedy alter'd' (p. 47; the opening to Spring); 'old Belerium' is identified as 'The Cape of Cornwall, or Land's end. Sec. Corn. Bri.' in Windsor Forest (p. 107); an allusion to Flatman is recorded in The dying Christian to his Soul (p. 131); Boileau again on page 201; the motto to the second edition of the five-canto Rape of the Lock has been inserted; and a reference to Ben Jonson's 'What gentle ghost, besprent with april dew,/Hayles me so solemnly to yonder yew,/And beckoning wooes me——' is noted below Pope's Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady (p. 265).

Wilkes restored the 'castration couplet' to Eloisa and Abelard which Pope had withdrawn after 1720, possibly at

<sup>2</sup>See K.I.D. Maslen, 'New Editions of Pope's Essay on Man 1745-48', PBSA, 62 (1968), 177-88.

the suggestion of Matthew Concanen.<sup>3</sup> In the third volume Wilkes passes over Brown's Essay on Satire although, again, he would have excised it completely from his ideal edition. On the verso of the half-title to the Essay on Man an engraving of Bolingbroke has been pasted in. Various readings from former editions are recorded, starting off with Pope's initial salutation to 'Laelius' which was soon changed to 'ST. JOHN'. A dozen of Wilkes's notes from the 1733a text recur in Mack's collation; a small but encouraging start towards modern textual research. Wilkes also caught a compositor's slip in the 1751 line, 'No one will charge his neighbour with himself', correcting it to 'change' (Essay on Man, II, 262; p. 68). This was corrected in the 1752 Works (although, because of an error in pagination, it appears on page 78). The person who wrote in to the Gentleman's Magazine in August 1751 to complain about the absence of Pope's design for the frontispiece to the Essay on Man would have been satisfied by Wilkes's intended reinstatement of it. Wilkes also restored three advertisements in his addenda to the third volume.

In the added pages (343-365) to his fourth volume, Wilkes included Sober Advice from Horace, 'Copied from the first folio Edition. The dedication and notes were omitted in all the subsequent Ed.' Following this is a clipping from the Gentleman's Magazine (April 1732) which tells the harrowing

<sup>3</sup> See Twickenham II, 340-41.

story of Richard Smith, a bookbinder, who was found hanging beside his wife and dead child. Page 370 of Wilkes's added material acknowledges Pope's nurse, Mary Beach, who tended him for thirty-eight years: 'Vid. p. 43' (Arbuthnot, 381ff.).

More than twenty pages of addenda have been written at the end of the Dunciad volume; and the 'Double Mistress' episode (which Warburton chopped without explaining the gap to his readers) is given in full following the Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus in volume VI. A letter to Swift has been transcribed at the end of volume VII; Verses address'd to the Imitator of the 1<sup>st</sup> Satire of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Bk of Horace and the Epistle from a Nobleman to a D.D. (as well as Serle's Plan of M<sup>r</sup> Pope's Garden) are given at the end of volume VIII. The last volume of letters - IX - gives extracts from those published in 1751 of the Aaron Hill correspondence.

Warburton's critic, Thomas Edwards, declined Richardson's suggestion of editing Pope himself. When urged to repair Spenser's text by Philip Yorke, Edwards replied, 'to publish a good Edition of an Old Author is not, as we find by melancholy experience, as easy a matter as to poach eggs'.<sup>4</sup> It may have been Hanmer who wisely pointed out, 'But the Province of an Editor and a Commentator is quite foreign to that of a Poet'.<sup>5</sup> At least the essayist On Woman did his research.

<sup>4</sup> Cited from Martin C. Battestin, 'A Rationale of Literary Annotation: the example of Fielding's novels', in Literary & Historical Editing; ed. George L. Vogt and John Bush Jones (Lawrence, Kansas, 1981), pp. 57-79; 57.

<sup>5</sup> See Guerinot, p. 267 [anonymous pamphlet].

POPE'S POSTHUMOUS BOOKSELLERS:

PROBLEMS IN THE BOOK TRADE

LONDON,  
.....

Printed by W. STRAHAN,

For J. and P. KNAPTON; T. and T. LONGMAN; C. HITCH and L. HAWES;  
A. MILLAR; and R. and J. DODSLEY.

MDCCLV.  
.....

Commendable studies of at least three names appearing in the 1755 imprint of Dr Johnson's Dictionary exist in book form.<sup>1</sup> Given the amount of documentation which has survived pertaining to their business, it is surprising that so little research has been carried out on the first name on the list

<sup>1</sup>See J. A. Cochrane, Dr. Johnson's Printer: the life of William Strahan (London, 1964); Philip Wallis, At the Sign of the Ship: notes on the house of Longman, 1724-1974, foreword by Elizabeth Longman (Harlow, 1974) [also Harold Cox and J.E. Chandler, The House of Longman 1724-1924, and Chandler's edition of C.J. Longman's bibliographical history, The House of Longman 1724-1800]; and Ralph Straus, Robert Dodsley: poet, publisher & playwright (London, 1910; rpt. New York, 1968).

Please note, dots under place and year in the above imprint indicate red on the original title-page.

of booksellers.<sup>2</sup> John and Paul Knapton were among the most prestigious booksellers of their day; indeed, they helped to raise the status not only of printer and author but also of the bookseller as a tradesman. With the increasing demand for books and the elevation of the professional man of letters, the middleman was expected to be the master of many functions. The bookseller had to know which authors would sell, how to smooth the ruffled feathers of the printer, how to talk an overbearing editor down from an over-elaborate quarto to a more marketable octavo edition; in short, he was called upon to be a diplomatic factotum.

The Knaptons undoubtedly fulfilled most of these prerequisites admirably; otherwise Pope would not have extended invitations to dine with him at Twickenham.<sup>3</sup> Warburton certainly held them in high esteem, corresponding frequently with them, sending chimes at Christmas time, or (as Pope once intimated to his editor) expressing his Augustan 'love'. But there were times when Warburton would testily remind John Knapton of his position and dig in his heels: 'This is my determination and I will be beholden to no body.'<sup>4</sup> I chose to introduce this chapter with the imprint of Dr

<sup>2</sup> See appendices. Imprints do not reflect the order of percentages of copyright ownerships, but rather, they reflect the booksellers' seniority in the Stationers' Company. See Terry Belanger, 'Booksellers' Trade Sales, 1718-1768', in The Library, 5th series, XXX, no. 4 (December, 1975), 281-302.

<sup>3</sup> Correspondence IV, 285 (25 October [1740]); 417 ([13 September 1742]).

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix A (n.d.; Egerton 1954.f.3).



Johnson's Dictionary because, in a way, this was the Knaptons' swan-song. John and Paul Knapton were part of the group of booksellers which presented the agreement to Dr Johnson on 18 June 1746 - in exchange for the overall sum of £1575 our illustrious lexicographer was to prepare a comprehensive dictionary within three years.<sup>5</sup> Within three months of the publication of the Dictionary, Johnson wrote to Thomas Warton, 'two of our partners are dead'.<sup>6</sup> One was Paul Knapton whose death on 12 June 1755 was recorded in Gentleman's Magazine; the other was Thomas Longman I who passed away six days later.<sup>7</sup> Shortly after his brother's death, John Knapton faced imminent bankruptcy. Our main concern here is to look at the Knaptons in their connection with Pope editions, although some background material might seem in order, given the lack of available scholarly material on this illustrious family.

James Knapton, son of William Knapton of Brockenhurst, Southampton, was bound to Henry Mortlock from 2 August 1680 until 5 September 1687.<sup>8</sup> At the end of his apprenticeship,

<sup>5</sup> See James L. Clifford, Dictionary Johnson (London, 1979), p. 46. The Dictionary was published by 15 April 1755 (p. 137).

<sup>6</sup> Cited from Clifford, p. 151.

<sup>7</sup> Dates from GM, XXV (1755), 284, and P. Wallis, At the Sign of the Ship, p. 12. Was it mere coincidence that the two booksellers died within a week of each other, or were the post-publication tavern celebrations fatally potent?

<sup>8</sup> D.F. McKenzie, editor, Stationers' Company Apprentices 1641-1700, Oxford Bibliographical Society (1974), p. 115 (item no. 3114) [hereafter cited as McKenzie, 1641-1700].

he set up his business at the Queen's Head in St Paul's Churchyard, later moving to the nearby Crown in 1690.<sup>9</sup> He seems to have remained at the same premises in St Paul's Churchyard until his death on 24 November 1736.<sup>10</sup> James Knapton acquired a reputation for sobriety and sound judgement, especially when it came to picking up lucrative copy-rights. John Dunton remembered him as the ideal bookseller:

A very accomplished person; not that sort of animal that flutters from tavern to playhouse, and back again, all his life made up with Wig and Cravat, without one dram of thought in his composition; but a person made up with sound worth, brave, and generous; and shews, by his purchasing of Dampier's Voyages, he knows how to value good copy.<sup>11</sup>

When William Bowyer's printing-house and warehouse were destroyed by fire on 30 January 1713, James Knapton was among those who contributed to a fund to assist the ruined but badly needed printer.<sup>12</sup>

James Knapton became a renter warden for the Stationers' Company in 1710; Jonah Bowyer held the same position three years later, and Bernard Lintott [sic] two years after that.

<sup>9</sup> Ambrose Heal, 'London Booksellers and Publishers, 1700-1750', Notes and Queries, vol. 161 (7 November 1931), 328.

<sup>10</sup> Date from GM and Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, III, 607.

<sup>11</sup> Nichols, I, 236

<sup>12</sup> Nichols, I, 2, 50ff., 62. Knapton gave 3 guineas; Jacob Tonson 5; Edmund Curll one. Damages amounted to £5146; from sixty-one subscribers, Bowyer received £2539 15s. 2d.

Knapton became an under warden in 1721 and 1722, an upper warden in 1725 and 1726, and a master of the Stationers' Company in 1727 and 1728.<sup>13</sup> During his last gild year as master, the printer James Bettenham, on 30 May 1728, entered the Dunciad in the Stationers' Register.<sup>14</sup> Knapton was a leading member in the wholesaling conger, a group of about fifteen booksellers which began to exert control over the scattered trade in the 1690s; he was second in seniority to Daniel Browne. The wholesaling conger could afford to buy expensive copyrights (any which were beyond the means of a single bookseller), and by spreading ownership the risk of piracy was somewhat reduced.<sup>15</sup>

When the wholesaling conger started breaking up in the 1720s, James Knapton became the senior member of the Castle Conger. His name is given first in the imprint of at least fourteen books published by the Castle Conger (including Wilford's Monthly Catalogue in 1729 and Bailey's Universal English Dictionary, fifth edition, 1731) between 1728 and 1737.<sup>16</sup> He was influential in seeking to advertise

<sup>13</sup>D.F. McKenzie, editor, Stationers' Company Apprentices, 1701-1800, Oxford Biblio. Soc. (1978), passim. [O.B.S. below]

<sup>14</sup>Foxon P765.

<sup>15</sup>See Terry Belanger, 'Publishers and writers in eighteenth-century England', in Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England, edited by Isabel Rivers (Leicester, 1982), p. 14.

<sup>16</sup>Norma Hodgson and Cyprian Blagden, The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements (1686-1719), O.B.S. no. 6 (1953), Appendix 13 and passim.

book prices in magazines. McKenzie records nine apprentices bound to James Knapton between 1696 and 1738 (the last presumably completely his training under a new master). One of these was Samuel Clarke, the rector of St James's in Westminster; another was John Knapton whose apprenticeship lasted from 4 February 1712 to 2 March 1719. As the boss's son, John Knapton did not have to pay for his book-trade education. In the Inland Revenue apprenticeship registers, taxes (at a shilling in the pound for premiums over £50) are recorded for five of James Knapton's apprentices, although one name - that of Paul Knapton - is duplicated under Arthur Bettesworth. Three of James Knapton's apprentices predated the 1709 Act which levied the tax; no amounts are entered for two others, one having had two previous masters and the other being John Knapton. Special arrangements were made for orphans of members of poor families who needed a trade.<sup>17</sup>

Paul Knapton's apprenticeship under Bettesworth (who received £70 for imparting his skills) ran from 1 May 1721 until 7 March 1728. His term overlapped with Charles Hitch who left Bettesworth in 1725. Why John Knapton served under his father and Paul, nine years later, went to learn the ropes in nearby Paternoster Row might be explained by the

<sup>17</sup> Compare McKenzie's Stationers' Company list with Ian Maxted's compilation of the Inland Revenue registers in The British Book Trades 1710-1777 (Exeter, 1983) [hereafter cited as Maxted].

fact that James Knapton took on John Crownfield as an apprentice the year before. Or possibly James Knapton, now a bit more affluent, thought his younger son could enhance the family business by working in - and learning from - someone else's shop.

Before we pursue this family any further, the various connections ought to be clarified. In their parallel series of booksellers' biographical entries, both F. T. Wood and Ambrose Heal follow Plomer in the erroneous assumption that James, John and Paul Knapton were all brothers.<sup>18</sup> This misinformation probably derives from Nichols who may have been confused by the number of Knaptons (three sons were christened James; the first two presumably did not survive infancy).<sup>19</sup> Although it was not unheard of for one brother to be bound to another, it would seem highly unlikely that two brothers could begin their apprenticeships over forty years apart. Accordingly, this discrepancy has not affected

<sup>18</sup>Accounts of the Knaptons (which err in calling James, John and Paul brothers) are found in Henry R. Plomer's Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668-1725 (London, 1922; rpt 1968); and Plomer's follow-up with assistance from G. H. Bushnell and E. R. McC. Dix, Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726-1775 (London, 1932; rpt 1968) [hereafter cited as Plomer (with relevant dates)]; and the concurrent lists of 'London Booksellers and Publishers, 1700-1750' by F. T. Wood and Ambrose Heal in Notes and Queries, 5th series, vol. 161 (12 September and 7 November 1931), 186 [Wood] and 328 [Heal]. With more and more information and minute details emerging each year - vide the ESTC - a revised catalogue of eighteenth-century booksellers is badly needed.

<sup>19</sup>Nichols, I, 236: James Knapton 'was succeeded by two of his brothers, John and Paul Knapton'.

recent scholarship.<sup>20</sup>

Thanks to the International Genealogical Index,<sup>21</sup> we are now able to trace booksellers' families with much greater accuracy. Although the date of James Knapton's birth is not recorded for London or Hampshire, we now know that he and his wife, Hester, had a dozen children between 1693 and 1709 all of whom were christened in Saint Faith under Saint Paul, the local parish church. The two Knaptons we are concerned with were seven years apart. John was born on 23 April 1696, the third child and presumably the first son to survive. Paul was the eighth child registered, being born on 20 January 1703. Although the DNB mentions that the two painters, George (1698-1778) and Charles (1700-60) Knapton, were the brothers of John and Paul, the London parish register makes no mention of them. Hester's namesake was born in August 1698, so it seems unlikely she gave birth to George in the same year (twins would certainly have been recorded). The DNB summary of George Knapton stresses the connection with the family of booksellers and points out that he 'assisted his brothers,

<sup>20</sup>For example, Norma Hodgson and Cyprian Blagden correctly point out that John and Paul Knapton succeeded their father in the Castle (or New) Conger in 1737, The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements (1686-1719), Appendix 13; and Terry Belanger mentions that by 1733 James Knapton had been joined in business by 'his sons John and Paul' in 'Booksellers' Trade Sales' (see note 2 above), p. 291.

<sup>21</sup>This index [IGI] was put out on microfiche by the Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in 1980 and it was updated in August 1981.



John and Paul, who succeeded to and extended their father's business, in the production of several fine publications, including Birch's "Lives" with heads by Houbraken, and Rapin and Tindal's "History of England". The only Charles Knapton listed, born in 1728, was the son of Charles and Elizabeth Knapton of Westminster; possibly the father was the artist. Might Charles and George have been adopted or cousins or born elsewhere? At any rate, James Knapton, his two bookselling sons, and the two artists had strong ties and various reasons to be connected with Pope. George Knapton, who studied under Jonathan Richardson, did an oil painting of Pope after Kneller;<sup>22</sup> James Knapton published the Richardsons' (père et fils) Account of Some of the Statues, Bas-reliefs, Drawings and Pictures in Italy, &c. with Remarks (1722) and Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost (1734/5).<sup>23</sup> By the time of the latter publication, James Knapton was joined by his two sons on the imprint. Charles Knapton collaborated with Arthur Pond (who designed the line engraving of Pope for the Knaptons' Heads of Illustrious Persons II 1751 as well as the Essay on Man medallion)<sup>24</sup> on a series of sixty-nine engravings from 1732 to 1736.<sup>25</sup> The Knaptons thus played an integral

<sup>22</sup>Wimsatt, pp. 62-64 (no. 7.2)    <sup>23</sup>Wimsatt, pp. 79n.; 140n.

<sup>24</sup>Wimsatt, pp. 328-29 (no. 66.16); 190-91 (no. 43.3). For more about Pond and the Knapton circle, see Louise Lippincott, Selling Art in Georgian England: the rise of Arthur Pond (New Haven, 1983); rev. by Pat Rogers, TLS (2 December 1983), p. 1337.

<sup>25</sup>Wimsatt, p. 329n. Wimsatt rightly questions Plomer's details (p. 188n).

part not only in publishing Pope's works but also his image. (George Knapton, it should be pointed out, was appointed the first portrait-painter to the Dilettanti Society and later received important commissions from the Prince of Wales and George III [DNB].)

One other confusion ought to be cleared up. Evans compounds Watson's mistaking John for Paul, wrongly lopping fifteen years off John's life: Warburton 'remained thoroughly satisfied with the Knaptons, and with John Knapton he formed a friendship which only ended with the latter's death in 1755.'<sup>26</sup> As mentioned, Paul (not John) died in 1755, and, as the correspondence between Warburton and the Knaptons suggests, things did not always run smoothly between Pope's editor and publishers.<sup>27</sup>

As far as we can tell from the correspondence, John Knapton was single. No children appear to be registered under his name in the IGI. Paul Knapton married Elizabeth Chalwell of Coleman Street at Stevenage in Hertfordshire on St Valentine's Day 1741.<sup>28</sup> She brought with her an ample dowry of £5000. Warburton would later call on her advice when he needed to find a new maid for his Bedford Row residence.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Evans, p. 141; Watson, p. 473. <sup>27</sup> See note 4 above.

<sup>28</sup> The marriage was reported by the Daily Press and Gentleman's Magazine, XI (March, 1741), 108.

<sup>29</sup> Egerton 1954.f.60 (30 May 1753); see Appendix A.

John Knapton became a renter warden of the Stationers' Company in 1723. (Andrew Millar, who would eventually replace the Knapton name on Pope imprints, occupied the same position twenty years later.) John was later elected under warden for 1735 and 1736 and became an upper warden in 1739 and 1740. From 1742 to 1744 he occupied the position of master of the Stationers' Company, following his father's foot-steps. Samuel Richardson (1754), Jacob Tonson (1759), Henry Woodfall (1766) and William Strahan (1774) all served as masters. On the other hand, Paul Knapton seems to have held no position whatsoever with the Stationers' Company. He seems to have had little to do with the day-to-day running of the shop, if Warburton's letters are any indication. When it came to acting as a go-between for truculent editor and overworked printer, shipping books to Prior Park or Germany, or keeping an eye out for scurrilous satires, John Knapton was the man Warburton wrote to. Paul perhaps led a life of modest luxury and let his brother manage most of the family business.<sup>30</sup>

. . . . .

Father and oldest son, James and John Knapton, share the same imprint on the multi-volume translation of Rapin's

<sup>30</sup> I recall seeing a French translation of the Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus, if memory serves, with the imprint 'CHEZ Paul Knapton' (1755). The ESTC will help in establishing single and collaborative imprints (e.g. how many titles did James, John and Paul publish independently?). [N.B. This is in the British Library catalogue: Cup.407.bb.15.]

History of England between 1726 and 1731. When sales of the edition proved much higher than originally expected, the Knaptons rewarded the translator, Nicolas Tindal, with an honorarium of £200. Upon completion of the History, Tindal was presented with a medal by the Prince of Wales, which would have been regarded by the trade as a feather in the Knapton cap.<sup>31</sup>

Terry Belanger, in his complex investigation of early eighteenth-century copyright shares, follows the changes in the imprint of Stanhope's Kempis between 1698 and 1738.<sup>32</sup> Here, with Ian Watt's seminal essay in mind,<sup>33</sup> may we witness the publishing sins of the father being passed on to the sons. Belanger marks the permutations in the imprint from 'J. Knapton' [i.e. James in 1698] to 'J., J. & P. Knapton' [the father and two sons in 1733], finally to 'J. & P. Knapton' [the two sons in 1738]. (Belanger also notes a number of mistakes in the last imprint, one of which concerns the updating of the Knapton initials in light of James's death in 1736.)<sup>34</sup>

According to Plomer (whom we must now regard with some caution), the Knaptons moved from the Crown in St Paul's

<sup>31</sup>Nichols, V, 516.

<sup>32</sup>Belanger, 'Booksellers' Trade Sales: 1718-1768', pp. 291-95 (see note 2 above).

<sup>33</sup>I.e. 'Publishers and Sinners: the Augustan view', in Studies in Bibliography, vol. 12 (1959), 3-20.

<sup>34</sup>'Booksellers' Trade Sales', p. 292.

Churchyard to the Crown in Ludgate Street in 1735. This would seem reasonably close as the Daily Courant published an advertisement for Monuments of Kings of England on 3 January 1735 with the imprint naming the three Knaptons at the Ludgate Street Crown. The date of closure of the family shop is as yet unknown. Plomer offers 1770 - the year of John Knapton's death - although the bookseller may well have retired or maintained his business in a limited capacity. He was active, at least, up until 1761 at which time he sold a third share of the copyright to The Fair Quaker of Deal to Thomas Loundes for two guineas.<sup>35</sup> In its heyday the Knapton premises would have received some of the most illustrious clientele of the mid eighteenth century and would have offered some of the finest books produced. Their shop was at once focal point and depot for various commercial arts: a poet would submit a manuscript, an editor might lodge a complaint (by post or in person); the printer would pick up his copy, his devil might return the printed version; a draughtsman might beg a commission, an engraver deliver his cuts; the binder could drop off a newly bound nine-volume set in calfskin, while an apprentice might be told to check that all the gatherings were in the right order or that no pages or fold-out maps had been crushed in transit. It would have been a busy life, all the while customers to

<sup>35</sup> This assignment of copyright is in the BL: Add. MSS. 38730.f.10. It is signed by John Knapton and dated 8 April 1761.

deal with and other booksellers to work out production details or to collect bundles of copies for distribution. The Knaptons were regarded as the top of their trade.<sup>36</sup>

. . . . .

The name of Knapton which headed the imprint on the first five posthumous editions of Pope's Works had not quite the same prominence during the poet's life-time. Pope's association with the Knaptons seems to have begun not long after the publication of the 1735 Works. He asked Sam Buckley to desire 'Mr Knapton to send me word what number of Second Vols. of my Works, Quarto or folio, are in his hands?'<sup>37</sup> As this query indicates, Pope was becoming increasingly concerned with the business side of the poet's lot. He had already set up his own printer and bookseller - John Wright and Lawton Gilliver - to produce and sell his works from 1729 in an effort to maintain full authorial control as well as to increase his profits. As J. McLaverty points out in his article, 'Lawton Gilliver: Pope's Bookseller', their arrangement became financially difficult.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup>At least Warburton thought so when he wrote to Hurd of Knapton's set-back: 'Mr. Knapton whom every body, and I particularly, thought the richest bookseller in town. . . ' (24 September 1755); see Appendix A.

<sup>37</sup>Correspondence, IV, 66 (13 April [1737]).

<sup>38</sup>In Studies in Bibliography, vol. 32 (1979), 101-24; p. 101.



Ten years after Pope quarrelled with Bernard Lintot over the Odyssey in 1725, he had a falling-out with Gilliver over the equal division of profits between poet and bookseller.<sup>39</sup> Pope, undeterred, helped set up yet another bookseller.

The man who would later be responsible for suggesting Lord Chesterfield as a likely patron for Dr Johnson's Dictionary began his bookselling career on the basis of his profits from The Toyshop and £100 from Pope. Robert Dodsley began publishing books at a time when the old established members of the trade were dying off - Bernard Lintot died on 3 February 1736 (succeeded by his son Henry), Jacob Tonson I passed away on 2 April 1736 (having been preceded by his nephew by the same name the year before), and James Knapton followed them towards the end of the year. The variations in Pope imprints in the late 1730s perhaps reflect the shifting structure within the trade. His desire to radicalize profit-sharing in the author's favour at a time when the trade was undergoing some re-adjustment coincided with the plans of a young poet and playwright (formerly Darty's footman) to set up his own shop.

Ralph Straus cites an advertisement for Pope's Works II from the Daily Courant (25 April 1735), 'printed for Lawton Gilliver... J. Brindley... and R. Dodsley', but later in his

<sup>39</sup> See also McLaverty's introduction to his ornament catalogue, Pope's Printer, John Wright, a preliminary study, O.B.S. no. 11 (Oxford, 1977), pp. 1-8, and his unpublished B.Litt. thesis, 'A Study of John Wright and Lawton Gilliver, Alexander Pope's printer and bookseller' (Pembroke College, Oxford, 1974), pp. 58-89 and appendices A-G, pp. 90-166.

bibliography Straus lists Works II in folio and quarto published by Knapton, Gilliver, Brindley and Dodsley which was advertised in the 17 May 1735 issue of the General Advertiser. Neither of these copies has been seen by Straus nor do they appear in the ESTC, based on the British Library holdings, nor in McLaverty's list of books printed by John Wright.<sup>40</sup> It seems unlikely, given the advertisements for the folio and quarto editions of Works II which appeared in the Grubstreet Journal on 23-24 April 1735 for Gilliver alone, the advertisements cited by Straus are accurate.<sup>41</sup> Griffith does not record any edition of Works II which was printed for Knapton, Dodsley and the two others in 1735.

The first instance I have been able to find (although I have yet to confirm this with the BLAISE computer) of a Pope-Knapton imprint is the 1737 quarto edition of the Letters - Pope's authorized text.<sup>42</sup> This, along with its folio version published on the same day (19 May), was printed by John Wright for J. Knapton, L. Gilliver, J. Brindley, and R. Dodsley. These are the same personnel as in Straus's advertisement, so perhaps an edition was misnomered

<sup>40</sup> Ralph Straus, Robert Dodsley: poet, publisher & playwright (1910; rpt New York, 1968), pp. 36; 317. Straus, who used the British Museum, seems not to have queried this.

<sup>41</sup> Dates for advertisements from McLaverty's Pope's Printer: John Wright, p. 20.

<sup>42</sup> Griffith 454, 455 [quartos]; 456, 457 [folios].

or aborted.

The fact that Pope employed the Knaptons for large editions only - folios and quartos - suggests that he might have been grooming Dodsley (who shares several of these imprints) for bigger publications. The Knaptons knew how to cope with the myriad details involved in a large project like Rapin's History. They were, if you like, specialists in sumptuous editions. They obviously had to adapt to the needs of a changing market by offering more affordable versions of an expensive edition. Still, the Knaptons could admirably handle long-term propositions (like the History) which must have tied up a considerable amount of capital over a number of years. A neophyte like Dodsley could hope to gain much by way of experience in associating with this prestigious pair of brothers. Pope might have been reticent about approaching the Knaptons while their father was still alive; a title like The Cruelties and Persecutions of the Romish Church (1728) in their list was bound to go against Pope's grain.

It may or may not be reading too much into imprints to suggest that Pope was working out the right formula of book-sellers for the definitive edition of his Works, an ideal which seems ultimately to have eluded him. Lawton Gilliver ran no fewer than eight Dunciad Variorums in 1729 (according to McLaverty's list of Wright's printing jobs), numerous Epistles (including Arbuthnot) and Essays on Man in the

early 1730s - ample preparation for the full complement of the 1735 Works, from folio down to octavo. Pope employed Gilliver to work on the 1736 Works II (Epistles and Satires) and IV (the Dunciad) in octavo, the 1737 Letters, the folio Epistle I vi of 1738, the quarto Works II of 1739 and others. After this, Gilliver's name faded from Pope imprints, and he went bankrupt in 1742.

Dodsley, in concert with Thomas Cooper, published the greater part of Pope's Works (in octavo) throughout the later 1730s and early 1740s. Cooper would predecease Pope - he died on 9 February 1743 - and leave his wife Mary to take over the business. The Coopers, as David Foxon points out, were publishers in the eighteenth-century sense; that is, their main occupation was selling pamphlets and periodicals.<sup>43</sup> Theirs was a much more direct approach to the market involving rapid printing and quick distribution on the street via mercuries and hawkers. This sort of publishing was ideally suited to those who could neither afford the time nor the premium of apprenticeship. By floating on the

<sup>43</sup> See David Foxon's unpublished (or soon to be published) typescript, the basis of his Lyell lectures at Oxford, 'Pope and the early eighteenth-century book-trade' (1975), 259pp. [BL: X.902/2958]. In his opening discussion on 'The meaning of imprint', he explores four basic variations on the 'London: printed by X, for Y, and sold by Z' formula: i) the usual city printer/bookseller(s)/distributor(s) arrangement; ii) the provincial printer or bookseller with a London agent; iii) those (like the Coopers) who specialized as publishers of pamphlets and periodicals (or newspapers); and iv) publishers, mercuries and hawkers (who functioned as distributors and sellers without being directly involved with authors or printers. Mercuries started as newspaper distributors (to hawkers) and did not own copyrights; they later merged with stall-holders and pamphlet shop-owners, selling anything that was printed. Pseudonymous or piratical imprints are also considered here.

open market, they might sell virtually anything from newspapers and periodicals to plays, broadsides, gallows speeches, almanacs and (shortly to be popular) chapbooks.<sup>44</sup> As distributors, 'publishers' would have had little need for a shop (unless for their own retailing), so overheads would have been minimal.

If an author or bookseller were concerned over potentially libellous material, this sort of publisher might be best suited for the job. Authorities might be less willing to prosecute a widow like Mary Cooper who (perhaps difficult to track down) could plead ignorance of an anonymous poem's satirical content (dealing as she did with so much ephemeral material). Perhaps these loopholes in part explain why Mary Cooper's name appears on the imprint of the 1743 Dunciad. It was by no means a false lead in view of the fact that she received a shipment of 500 copies (out of 1500 Demy and 100 Royal) from Bowyer on 14 October 1743. Her name was also entered two weeks later (in time for the king's birthday)<sup>45</sup> in the Stationers' Register.<sup>46</sup> Or perhaps, as her recently deceased husband had handled the New Dunciad of 1742, Mary Cooper might best know how to distribute the 1743 edition.

<sup>44</sup>For a recent comparative study of chapbooks and their originals, see Pat Rogers, 'Classics and chapbooks', in Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England, edited by Isabel Rivers (Leicester, 1982), pp. 27-45.

<sup>45</sup>Twickenham V, xxxii, n. 3.

<sup>46</sup>Foxon P796.



Given the frequency of T. Cooper imprints on octavo editions of Pope's Works from 1737 to 1742 (I make eight in the BL/ESTC catalogue) and Dodsley-Cooper Works from 1739 to 1743 (another ten), the Cooper premises at the Globe in Pater-noster Row must have been more than simply a depot. Perhaps when they were a husband and wife team, Thomas and Mary Cooper carried out separate functions in the trade; one carting books through the streets, the other minding the shop.

The Knaptons, being booksellers as opposed to 'publishers', had a much more solid establishment. Their gradual build-up over decades enhanced their status within the trade and they established a considerable reputation in the eyes of their readers with a fine line of theological and historical treatises, Chambers' Cyclopaedia, Bailey's Dictionary, Ainsworth's Latin-English Thesaurus, Chess Made Easy (and other instructive manuals like The Complete Measurer, The Trader's Companion and A Treatise of Artificial Magnets), and poetry. This last category must always have been regarded with a certain degree of circumspection. The rough-and-ready buyer when asking the bookseller 'What's in it?' would get no practical answer like 'It tells you how to cure the glanders.' A more genteel reader, upon enquiring into the nature of its contents, might be persuaded to purchase the book on the basis that everyone else of sense and status has read or is reading it.



In his review article on David Foxon's Lyell lectures, Nicolas Barker retraces Pope's manoeuvres in the book trade from his 1709 debut in the sixth volume of Tonson's Poetical Miscellanies up to his 'death-bed' editions:

Finally, as a sharp contemporary put it, Pope "turned Bookseller to himself, selling all his own Pieces by means of a Publisher, without giving his Bookseller any share of them". The distributor, as we should say, was Thomas Cooper, employed (in fairness to Pope) through Dodsley.<sup>47</sup>

The relationship between Pope, Dodsley, Cooper and the Knaptons is by no means clear-cut. If we look at imprints from the Wright press in 1738 we find various permutations of names: T. Cooper is found alone on four items, different impressions of the poem which took its name from its year (three of Dialogue I; one of Dialogue II); Dodsley alone appears on two folios (The Universal Prayer and Dialogue II); and the Dodsley-Cooper duo figures in two items (both folios of Epistle I i).

Gilliver, who was being phased out around this time, publishes Epistle I vi on his own, but collaborates with Knapton, Brindley and Dodsley on two editions of the Epistles of Horace Imitated. Curiously, although Dodsley's name appears on different occasions either independently or in

<sup>47</sup>Nicolas Barker, 'Pope and his publishers', Times Literary Supplement (3 September 1976), p. 1085.

conjunction with Cooper (as distributor) or Knapton (as co-publisher), Knapton and Cooper never share the same imprint. Perhaps Cooper's role was implied on multiple imprints; on the other hand, Knapton may have taken care of distribution (or at least part of it) through his usual channels whenever his name appeared in an imprint. Brindley's part in the overall process of connecting manufacturer with market - in this case, supplying his customers with printed goods - is likewise unclear. In <sup>the</sup> case of Pope's posthumous Works, the division of booksellers' shares may be determined from extant profit accounts (see Appendix B).

. . . . .

Although none of the correspondence between Pope and John Knapton has survived (unlike the ample sheaf of Warburton's letters to Knapton in Appendix A), Sherburn's index offers a not totally discouraging number of cross-references.<sup>48</sup> As we have already noted, Knapton received some of the left-over copies of Works II (which he evidently had in 1737); he and his brother also acted as agents in the subscription in 1737 of the Letters. With the recent addition to the Correspondence made by Maynard Mack in Collected in Himself,<sup>49</sup>

<sup>48</sup>If Knapton kept so many of Warburton's letters, might it not follow that he saved Pope's as well, assuming Pope did, on occasion, write to him; or perhaps they were lost?

<sup>49</sup>See Mack's Appendix B, 'Letters from, to, or about Pope: Unpublished, Partly Published, or Now First Published from Originals' (Newark, 1982), pp. 461-550.

we are now more aware of the extent of John Knapton's involvement in Pope's and Warburton's legal wrangles. Sherburn's Correspondence has shown us that when Warburton's bookseller, Fletcher Gyles, died late in 1741 Pope quickly recommended Knapton's services.<sup>50</sup> Charles Bathurst, whose name would be added to the imprint of the 1752 Works, seems to have expressed an interest in taking over Warburton's affairs; but Pope firmly intended that Knapton would succeed.<sup>51</sup> By 22 November he has volunteered to act as literary agent:

But in particular I think you should take some care as to Mr Gyles's Executors. and I am of Opinion no man will be more Serviceable in settling [sic] any such accounts, than Mr Knapton, who so well knows the trade & is so acknowledged a Credit in it. I ought to have told you when I wrote, that He did not desire to be employed in your Books, if Mr Gyles's children carried on the business to your satisfaction: which is a piece of Honourable Dealing, not common to all Booksellers.<sup>52</sup>

So Pope is responsible for the alliance which would result in the 1751 Works, but his fervent interest in Warburton's choice of booksellers may not be altogether manipulative. Mack's additional letters reveal that Pope was impressed with John Knapton's handling of James Watson's piracy of the Letters four years earlier. Gilliver had sued Watson

<sup>50</sup> Corr. IV, 370.

<sup>51</sup> Corr. IV, 371-72.

<sup>52</sup> Corr. IV, 373. Again, Warburton's excisions are worth noticing. Or did the bookseller not wish his early reticence known?

in 1729 over the Dunciad, and now he printed an octavo edition of the Letters under the name of Thomas Johnson.

Mack has uncovered twenty-two items relating to Robert Dodsley's proceedings against Watson in Chancery.<sup>53</sup> We know from Sherburn that Pope wrote to the solicitor to the Stationers' Company, Nathaniel Cole, on the advice of William Murray.<sup>54</sup> Mack's seventh item in this sequence now positively dates Cole's reply to Pope; and the eleventh item, a letter from James Watson to John Knapton dated 30 November 1737, pinpoints Sherburn's date of Pope's invitation to Samuel Buckley for a business dinner.<sup>55</sup> If the poet's meeting with his solicitor and bookseller was meant to agitate Watson, it seems to have done the trick. The piratical printer's letter to Knapton maintains he has not infringed upon copyright law. The most Pope 'can expect in Equity, is an Injunction'. However, Watson is more than anxious to make an out-of-court settlement. He wants Knapton to mediate:

His Folio Edition is not the same Book he complains against, and his Octavo was not Enter'd till October 31. last past, which was at least a full Month after the Publication of the Edition complain'd of, and his own first Edition entirely sold before the Octavo was Enter'd. I should be glad, if you could be any Instrument of stopping any further

<sup>53</sup>See Collected in Himself, pp. 491-501. <sup>54</sup>Corr. IV, 87-88.

<sup>55</sup>Corr. IV, 88-89 [23 November 1737]. Knapton and Cole are also expected to dine with Pope on Saturday next.

Proceedings in this Affair, and if that Gentleman who claims the Property will yield a little to my Necessities, I will submit a great deal to his supposed Right. You shall have an Account of the Paper, and the Printing is easily computed, and I am willing to deliver everything upon your Determination, if Mr. Pope is willing likewise, that you should be the Arbitrator.<sup>56</sup>

An agreement was reached fairly quickly: Pope dined at Knapton's house in Marsh-gate (now the Sheen Road)<sup>57</sup> on 29 November and by 1 December Watson was arranging to put the books in Knapton's hands 'as soon as they can be press'd and ty'd up'.<sup>58</sup> Although Watson later complained about the rigid penalty, Pope was quite satisfied with Knapton's handling of the affair. He no doubt foresaw the sort of copyright problems which his posthumous editor (still to be met in 1737) might face. Four years later, Pope evidently thought John Knapton was the most capable bookseller to manage Warburton's publishings as well as his own literary estate.

It is surprising then that after publishing five posthumous editions of Pope's Works, the Knapton business verged on bankruptcy. My appendices provide considerable detail as to the financial structure of their operation. As their bank account at Gosling's shows, the Knaptons (like most booksellers) juggled thousands of pounds in credits and debits, but their

<sup>56</sup> Collected in Himself, p. 496 [N.B. I have omitted Mack's slashmarks which indicate lineation.].

<sup>57</sup> Collected in Himself, p. 519-20, n. 3.

<sup>58</sup> Collected in Himself, p. 497.

balance was rarely much more than £100. Paul Knapton's death on 12 June 1755 may have precipitated the collapse of his brother's business. As we shall soon see, the Knaptons' long-outstanding account with Bowyer rose to nearly £1500 three days before Paul's death. (One hopes Bowyer didn't finally present his bill only to have Paul Knapton throw himself into the Thames.) Within a couple of days, some two dozen members of the book trade contributed £475 4s., and the account was reviewed by Gosling (who knew the book trade well, having been a publisher).

Business carried on, but John Knapton was forced to put his copyrights on the auction block. A trade sale was held on 25 September 1755, the catalogue for which is given in Appendix D. Knapton's copyrights alone realized a total of £4642 11s. 9d. - more than enough to pay off his debts to Bowyer and Warburton. The trusteeship which was formed by a group of booksellers was dissolved by June 1756. His account after that shows that Knapton was well out of the bailiff's reach. Had it been a matter of mismanagement, inept book-keeping, ordering too many non-sellers (whose printing and storage still had to be paid for), or did John Knapton simply wish, as he approached sixty, to ease off into a less complicated, less cluttered, less competitive retirement? The map of literature had changed considerably in their time. The Knapton imprint on Rapin's History, Birch's Heads of Illustrious Persons, Johnson's Dictionary and Pope's Works underlies the greatest published works of its age.



### Knapton Advertisements

No advertisements (in the modern sense of the word) appear in the first three Warburton editions. However, at the end of the third volume of the small octavo edition of 1753, there is a list of 'BOOKS printed for John and Paul Knapton, in Ludgate-Street' which gives us an idea of what was contained in their store-room. First on the list is the recent large octavo Works 'Together with the Commentaries and Notes of Mr. Warburton'. Presumably there were sets of both the 1751 and 1752 large octavo editions of Pope still available; both fit the description of being 'Adorned with 24 Copper-Plates'.

Next on the list comes the Essay on Man with notes by Warburton at 1s. 6d. This could refer to at least five cheap editions of the Essay published by the Knaptons after Pope's death.<sup>1</sup> At least one edition of Pope's 'little Essay' carries a price of eighteen pence on its title-page.<sup>2</sup> The 1753 advertisement shows that there were still copies of the 1743/4 quarto editions of the Essay on Criticism and the Essay on Man to be had at three shillings. Two editions of the Dunciad with Warburton's notes were also available - the 1749/50 octavo at two shillings, and the 1743 quarto at four shillings.

<sup>1</sup>See K.I.D. Maslen's bibliographical study of five Knapton octavos, 'New Editions of Pope's Essay on Man 1745-48', PBSA, 62 (1968), 177-88.

<sup>2</sup>BL copy 11632.aaa.39 (Foxon P868; Griffith 607).

The Knaptons still had copies of 'Four Ethic Epistles' - the 1744 'death-bed' Epistles to Several Persons in quarto which was suppressed until 1748 - in stock, although their 1747 octavo edition of Ethic Epistles (containing the Essay on Man and what Warburton later called the Moral Essays) does not appear on the 1753 list.<sup>3</sup> No price is given for the 'Four Ethic Epistles', but it presumably would have cost less than the quarto Dunciad (four shillings) which is more than twice the number of pages. Folio and quarto editions of Pope's Letters in two volumes, dating back to 1737, are still available for sale. Also gathering dust on the Knapton shelves: Pope's translation of the Odyssey is advertised in the quarto five-volume series. Volumes four and five may be bought separately in the same format. Surprisingly, there are still copies for sale of the folio edition of Pope's Works II, some eighteen years after it was published by Lawton Gilliver. Last Pope item on the 1753 list is a two-volume translation in duodecimo, Selecta Poemata Italorum, going for six shillings.

The 1753 advertisement continues with a selection of Warburton's writings, including Julian, the Divine Legation and his 1742 A Critical and Philosophical Commentary on Mr. Pope's Essay on Man, the expanded version of his Vindication. The Commentary, selling for two shillings, might have seemed superfluous to buyers who had already purchased the Essay on

<sup>3</sup>For a discussion of the comparatively rare edition of the 1747 Ethic Epistles, see Appendix F.

Man with its dense Warburtonian subtext. Warburton's M.A. status is amply lettered throughout the advertisement. Not the least of surplus stock is Pope-Warburton edition of Shakespeare of 1747 in eight volumes octavo.

More or less the same list of books appears at the back of the fourth volume of the ten-volume edition of Pope's Works in 1754. The only additional item in the Pope catalogue is the small octavo Warburton edition which sold for twenty-seven shillings in 1751. Like its larger counterpart, this edition is advertised as having Warburton's notes (although the title-page reads 'With Occasional Notes'; many were dropped from the first edition) and the same twenty-four copper-plates.

That the same dozen Pope titles are advertised one year to the next suggests a sluggishness in trade. Buyers of Warburton edition in large, crown or pot octavo would have little incentive to add, for example, the 1735 Works II to their already 'complete' set. The economical logic of the market-place which Andrew Millar knew so cannily - 'Your plain English reader loves his pennyworth for a penny' - spelt misfortune, if not death, to the Knapton bookselling business. People evidently shied away from buying old, extravagant folio and quarto editions. The Knaptons adapted to the market by producing cheaper editions (vide the 1754 pot octavo with an impression of 3000 copies compared to falling numbers of the first two large octavos from 1500 in 1751 to 750 in 1752).

### The Knaptons and the Bowyers<sup>1</sup>

The Knapton account with their main printers, the two William Bowyers, stretches from 1725 (when James Knapton was running the business) to 1764 (when John Knapton would have retired). The elder William Bowyer died in 1737, and subsequently 'entries in all three ledgers begin to fall off in quality, and towards the end of the period in quantity as well.'<sup>2</sup> Thus, for duration of Warburton's editorship, the ledgers are neither neatly kept nor exhaustive. Time has taken its toll as well, in the form of fire damage and crumbling (which explains the absence of pence in the following figures).

However, what has survived of Bowyer's ledgers gives us a sufficient idea of the mounting debts which the Knaptons incurred with their printer around the time of the posthumous Pope editions. During the late 1740s Bowyer printed the works of various authors for the Knaptons: Pope and Warburton, obviously, and sermon-writers like Hoadly, Clarke and Sharp. Many religious writers flagged in popularity, hence sales, leaving the booksellers with a large surplus which would be hard to sell.

By the early 1750s Bowyer's printing ledger 'B'

<sup>1</sup>I am indebted to Keith Maslen of the University of Otago for much of the information in this section about the Knaptons' account in the Bowyer ledgers. His facsimile edition of Bowyer's ledgers is in progress.

<sup>2</sup>K.I.D. Maslen, The Bowyer Ornament Stock, Oxford Bibliographical Society occasional publication no. 8 (1973), p. 2.

begins to show a sharp accumulation of unpaid bills. The Knaptons' account at Gosling's Bank shows a payment of £50 to Bowyer on 15 April 1755, although few other payments were made to Bowyer through the bank. And the Knaptons were falling behind with their payments to William Strahan for printing Johnson's Dictionary around this time.<sup>3</sup> By 9 June 1755, just three days before Paul Knapton's death, the Knaptons owed Bowyer the staggering sum of £1470 6s. This was more than the Knaptons made in profits from the five editions of Pope's Works.

Rumours were apparently circulating that Bowyer was going to sue John Knapton (which might have ended in bankruptcy), but Bowyer wrote on 20 September 1755 to assure his old client of his good will.<sup>4</sup> James Knapton, after all, had helped the elder William Bowyer when his print-shop burned down in 1713.<sup>5</sup> Still, the printer had to be paid his outstanding debt and wished to renounce his office as one of Knapton's trustees. The amounts paid in to John Knapton's bank account two days after his brother's death helped reduce his debt to Bowyer to £1010.

The money raised by the auction of Knapton's stock

<sup>3</sup>The Knaptons missed the first payment to Strahan and were late on their instalment of £38 on 9 November 1753. See J.A. Cochrane, Dr. Johnson's Printer: the life of William Strahan (London, 1964), pp. 26-27.

<sup>4</sup>Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, II, 278 (see Appendix A).

<sup>5</sup>Nichols, I, 62.

and copyright on 25 September 1755 helped to alleviate Knapton's financial problems, but at the same time his future in the trade was seriously restricted to a minor role. Once he parted with his copyrights, John Knapton ceased to function as a publisher-bookseller. At least, he honoured his financial obligation to his printer. By 3 June 1756, by which time Knapton's affairs were being administered by a trusteeship (made up of himself, the Longmans, Hitch, Millar, and Dodsley), his debt was reduced by 75%: £463 was paid in cash while £294 19s. 6d. in notes drawn on several booksellers was received, payable up to 4 May 1757.

The remainder of the debt was paid off at various intervals. Between 4 November 1757 and 17 November 1758 notes worth £245 (plus £7 13s. in cash) were received by Bowyer from Knapton or his trustees. As the trusteeship was wound up by 23 March 1757, Knapton was managing to see his way out of the near-collapse of his business. Bowyer was eventually paid in full and continued to serve as a printer for Knapton. It may have taken the better part of three years for Knapton to recover (which he no doubt did through the good auspices of fellow booksellers and Warburton, who was one of his biggest creditors in 1755), and it meant losing the main proprietorship of Pope's Works, but he evidently made enough money to live and retire on in modest comfort.



### Andrew Millar

The Maecenas of his age who 'raised the price of literature', according to Dr Johnson, Andrew Millar (1707-68) was not so well regarded by Warburton. As far as Warburton was concerned, anyone commercially involved in the publication of a socially disruptive writer like Bolingbroke 'is just as honest a man who for reward undertakes to scatter poison into all the Wells & Cisterns of his Neighbourhood'.<sup>1</sup> Yet in spite of Warburton's antipathy, Millar went ahead with the project. Bolingbroke's Works, edited by yet another of Warburton's enemies, David Mallet, came out under the Millar imprint in 1754. It is surprising then to see Millar's name replacing the Knaptons' in the 1756 imprint of Pope's Works. Either Millar performed a minor miracle of salesmanship or Warburton had no other bookseller to turn to when the Knaptons' business nearly collapsed. Millar also became Warburton's publisher. Two completely opposed and openly hostile writers might be published or printed by the same man. Feuds, as Millar knew, fed the presses; when the controversy over Pope's surreptitious edition of the Patriot King erupted in 1749, Bowyer printed 'a very large impression' of the bona fide version in anticipation of good sales.

<sup>1</sup>Egerton 1959.f.16.v (December 1753); see Appendix A.

Son of a Paisley minister, Andrew Millar began his apprenticeship under James McEuen of Edinburgh in 1720.<sup>2</sup> Some time around 1729, he set up shop in the Strand, then moved into Jacob Tonson's old premises at Shakespeare's Head (renamed Buchanan's Head) over against Catherine Street.<sup>3</sup> He paid out the impressive sum of £137 10s. to his fellow Scotsman James Thomson for the copyright to Sophonisba and Spring in 1729, later buying the sole right to the Seasons in 1738. When this work was pirated by a large group of Scottish booksellers, Millar launched a lengthy and ultimately fruitless law suit in the Edinburgh Court of Session.

Pope seems to have had little to do with Millar in a professional capacity, although Pope was familiar with at least a couple of Millar's titles: Thomson's Works<sup>4</sup> and Fielding's Joseph Andrews, the second volume of which he sent to Anne Arbuthnot.<sup>5</sup> Millar's name was raised only once in Pope's correspondence in connection with the bookseller's successful action over a piracy of Joseph Andrews: 'if Millar has had redress, I may'.<sup>6</sup> Millar's case bode

<sup>2</sup> See Stationers' Company Apprentices 1701-1800, ed. D.F. McKenzie, Oxford Bibliographical Society (1978); The British Book Trades 1710-1777, compiled by Ian Maxted (Exeter, 1983), p. 61. Millar paid a £40 premium.

<sup>3</sup> See entry under Millar in DNB.

<sup>4</sup> For full entry, see Mack's list of 'Pope's Books' in English Literature in the Age of Disguise, ed. Novak, p. 298.

<sup>5</sup> Correspondence, IV, 394.

<sup>6</sup> Correspondence, IV, 425.

well for Pope's own projected suit in Chancery over the Dunciad.<sup>7</sup> Pope would certainly have had an interest in Millar's struggle to maintain monopolies in copyright.

Although he may have little idea about the aesthetic <sup>refinements</sup> ~~fineries~~ of literature, Millar possessed a canny sense of what his customers wanted. His basic principle - 'Your plain English reader loves his penny <sup>worth</sup> for his penny' - no doubt helped bring books to a larger audience than ever before. Too many frills, too wide a margin, too many ten-shilling words on the title-page, and the majority of buyers will back off. Millar's escalating payments to Henry Fielding - £183 for Joseph Andrews (1742); £700 for Tom Jones (1749); and a thousand guineas for Amelia (1751)<sup>8</sup> - reflect a sense of equity between author and bookseller. Millar's response to the brisk sales of Tom Jones was to add £100 to Fielding's original £600, which was perhaps just as helpful in terms of publicity as it was generous. Millar's reputation for raising the price of literature (at least as far as novelists, lexicographers, and poets were concerned) would have passed on to the buyer a sense of paying the usual amount for a better product. Paying authors more could be used as good publicity; for example, readers of Tom Jones who

<sup>7</sup> See Some Chancery Lawsuits 1714-1758, compiled by R.J. Goulden (Croydon, 1982), part II, p. 1. Pope sued Curl (1741); Lintot (1742/3); Ilive (1742/3); Bickham (1743/4).

<sup>8</sup> Figures taken from Fielding's Tom Jones, edited by R.P.C. Mutter (Harmondsworth, 1981), pp. 8-9.

heard that Millar had paid substantially more for Amelia might be more readily inclined to rush out and buy a set.

Millar's association with Fielding would have stood him in good stead with the Allens, George Lyttleton, and perhaps even Warburton. (Tom Jones does, after all, contain a fair number of references to Pope which might prime some of its readers for the 1751 Works; and Warburton is celebrated for his learning in the invocation at the opening of book XIII at a time when the editor would have been glad of a friendly word in print.<sup>9</sup>) Millar made at least one trip to Prior Park to see Warburton shortly after his edition of Pope's Works came out, perhaps with the intention of ousting the Knaptons as the main publishers.

Warburton wrote to Knapton about the meeting: 'We talked of matters of his profession. He said several absurd things which it is not worth while to trouble you with.'<sup>10</sup>

One series of letters between Warburton and Knapton concerns the sale of books bought from Pope's executors, Bolingbroke and Marchmont, which Warburton wants to split with Draper and Millar.<sup>11</sup> Through a misunderstanding with the two booksellers, Warburton receives £250 instead of £425.

<sup>9</sup>Fielding, Tom Jones: references to Pope crop up at frequent intervals from the dedication and opening chapter on (pp. 36, 52, 241, 257, 340, 361, 532, 657). For Warburton see p. 609 (Penguin edition).

<sup>10</sup>Egerton 1954.f.32 (11 October 1751); see Appendix A.

<sup>11</sup>Egerton 1954.ff.3-7 (undated); see Appendix A.

In his first letter concerning this transaction, Warburton sounds untypically hostile towards Knapton:

'This is my determination and I will be beholden to no body.' In the next letter Warburton discloses his mistake - a £175 misunderstanding which has been to Millar's and Draper's advantage. The exact nature of this bargaining is not clear from the letters, although Warburton does not think he has been deceived by the booksellers. And the outcome has apparently been to Knapton's benefit: 'the price they understood I intended to let them have the share for, which I sold them, induced them to rise so high in the purchase of yours.' For a man of Warburton's legalistic background and penchant for harangues, Millar must have combined the utmost of discretion (or at least common sense) and shrewdness.

The correspondence over the publication of Bolingbroke's Works bears out Millar's diplomatic qualities.<sup>12</sup> Warburton will never be convinced, but Millar tries his hardest to gain a favourable response. After his initial enquiry is met with Warburton's condemnation, Millar argues the negative virtues to be gained by publishing Bolingbroke's philosophy; a variation on the 'know thine enemy' theme. 'I am fully convinced,' maintains the bookseller, 'it will be of advantage to them [i.e. Christians] on the

<sup>12</sup> See Egerton 1954 ff.73, 75, 82-83 and 1959. ff.15, 16r and v (late December 1753—16 February 1754); see Appendix A.

whole, by engaging persons of real abilities and just discernment to place the Evidences of our Religion in a stronger & clearer light.'<sup>13</sup> Millar claims he has consulted a group of experts and lay people - some of distinction 'not unknown to you' - all of whom find nothing objectionable about publishing Bolingbroke's Works. Warburton sees nothing but folly in this view and writes back to Millar to 'set him right'.

The publication of Bolingbroke's Works proceeded in fits and starts. Mallet, the editor, perhaps on the assumption that he had a best-seller on his hands (given the large impression of Patriot King five years earlier), rejected Millar's initial figure of £3000 for the copyright and later returned having to beg Millar's help when no other bookseller was interested. At one stage Millar told Warburton he had abandoned the project, and Warburton wrote to Knapton of 'his final resolution . . . not to have his name to Bol.<sup>S</sup> works, nor to have any thing to do with them.' Then, with the satisfaction of having just made a convert, Warburton adds, 'The first good thing in this world is a steady honest man, the next is a sincere penitent.' Warburton's reaction when he discovered Millar's name on the Bolingbroke imprint has not survived, but it would have been vehement. Millar may have attempted

<sup>13</sup> Egerton 1959.f.15 (Appendix A), 1 January 1754.



to take the edge off Warburton's wrath by sending him an advance copy of the edition, as Warburton mentions having 'looked into Bolingbroke' on 28 January 1754, and the Works were not published until March.<sup>14</sup>

One benefit of the publication of Bolingbroke's Works was that it enabled Warburton to launch a counter-attack. This did not cost him much effort as the ground-work had already been done by 1751. After the 1749 controversy, Warburton planned a major rebuttal to be published in the Pope edition. He went so far as to have the attack printed up for the large octavo Works, but subsequently changed his mind (perhaps on the advice of a mutual acquaintance like Chesterfield, Murray, or Lyttleton). A couple of months after Bolingbroke's Works appeared, Warburton wrote to Knapton asking him to forward 'one of those letters to Bol: which was printed for the large Pope, & suppressed'.<sup>15</sup> Negotiations over the publication of Warburton's View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy; in four letters to a friend continued throughout the summer and into the new year of 1755. Warburton was particularly meticulous over details of presentation: he originally wanted the View to be published in quarto (which would have rendered the already printed

<sup>14</sup>Egerton 1954.f.75. For date of and reaction to Bolingbroke's Works, see H.T. Dickinson, Bolingbroke (London, 1970), pp. 298-99.

<sup>15</sup>Egerton 1954.f.89 (19 June 1754).

octavo sheets useless). When Knapton evidently advised against a large format, Warburton accepted the decision 'only on this condition that you make it a very beautiful book'. Warburton's View was to come out in three instalments, the first two letters together (comprising 175 pages), the third (179 pages), and the fourth (196 pages). His instructions may not have pleased the printer:

I would not have the end of one [letter] and the beginning of another both on the same leaf; neither would I have an entire blank page. I suppose the printer can contrive to prevent either inconvenience.<sup>16</sup>

The last letter of Warburton's View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy would have been one of the last works to carry the imprint of John and Paul Knapton. It may have been just this sort of production - long, cumbersome, slow to sell - which tipped the scales downwards on the Knapton business. With their debts to Bowyer alone well over a thousand pounds at this time, all they needed was a large warehouse full of the remnants of an old controversy.

When Paul Knapton died in 1755 and John Knapton was forced to sell part of his stock and copyrights, a trusteeship (made up of various members of the book trade, including Millar) was formed to administer Knapton's finances.

<sup>16</sup>Egerton 1954.f.92 (2 July 1754).

Within two months of the auction when most of the bids from the auction were paid, £1600 was quartered evenly by four members of the trust - Millar, Dodsley, Longman, and Knapton himself. Once it became apparent that Knapton could survive financially yet not sufficiently to publish Pope's Works, Warburton would have looked around for another bookseller to deal with. None of Pope's Works or copyrights were sold at the auction; these were presumably transferred privately. Three letters in Appendix A (Egerton 1954.ff.3-7; undated) may relate to this transaction.

Perhaps Millar was chosen by Warburton because he was amenable to the sort of changes the editor wanted to make, such as putting his notes at the end of each poem rather than at the bottom of each page.<sup>17</sup> The 1756 edition - the first of Pope's Works to have Millar's name on the imprint - is a lacklustre product compared with the 1751 model: no red ink spilled on the title-page, and the engravings have been redone in an inferior fashion. But the main purpose - of hitting the right balance - of offering a nine-volume octavo edition at as low a price as can be afforded by the booksellers - was achieved. Warburton wanted to 'swell it out a little more' while Millar saw the need to economize on large editions. With the 1756 edition, both ends seem to have been accomplished.

<sup>17</sup>See Egerton 1954.f.58 (25 April 1753).

In all, Millar's name appears on seven imprints of the Warburton edition from 1756 to 1766.<sup>18</sup> His apprentice and ultimate successor, Thomas Cadell, maintained a financial interest in Pope's Works, although the number of proprietors grew (e.g., there are fifteen names on the imprint of the 1770 small octavo edition) and the percentages of shareholders would have spread thin with various compound fractions. The larger the group, the fewer the profits; but also the less likelihood of repeating Knapton's mistake of carrying too much of the financial responsibility. Of the original 1751 proprietors, Charles Bathurst was the sole survivor. His name heads the list of booksellers on the quarto edition of 1769 and reoccurs on at least three other Pope imprints, the last one being the six-volume duodecimo of 1787/88.

Warburton's calculation of his profits while he 'had 2 3<sup>ds</sup> <sup>[sic]</sup> of his work' on 18 May 1759 (see Appendix B) gives us some idea of Millar's share: Knapton sold his one-third part to Tonson and Millar in 1755 to which was added one-sixth of Warburton's share, which made Tonson's and Millar's share, on the one hand, and Warburton's on the other, fifty-fifty. So, after the smaller shares were accounted for, Millar received a quarter of the profits.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> 1756 (9vols); 1757 (9 vols); 1757 (10 vols); 1760 (9 vols); 1764 (6 vols); 1764 (6 vols; 12mo); 1766 (9 vols).

<sup>19</sup> Warburton split his share with the Knaptons three ways, keeping two-thirds for himself; but his overall percentage was about half (51%), so Millar and Tonson would have split about a quarter (26%) of the overall profits. The rest would have gone to Lintot, Draper, and Bathurst (23%).

Relations between Millar and Warburton, never more than perfunctory, seem to have declined considerably. Warburton complained about Millar's silence over the re-printing of The Alliance between Church and State in 1761; the next and fourth edition was not published until 1766.<sup>20</sup> However, Millar was involved in the publication of Warburton's sermons and the two-volume Doctrine of Grace (1763). His neglect of Warburton's missives is understandable: Bowyer and Knapton had been plagued by them before; and Millar had other, more important writers in his stable, including Robertson and yet another of Warburton's opponents, David Hume.

One link between the polemical writer-editor and the Scots publisher was their concern over literary property. The spirit of Warburton's Letter from an Author to a Member of Parliament concerning Literary Property of 1748 was continued by Millar's legal battles to secure perpetual copyright in common law.<sup>21</sup> Their motives, however, were somewhat different. Warburton was primarily concerned with defining what constitutes 'literary property' (e.g.

<sup>20</sup> Letters from a late Eminent Prelate, edited by R. Hurd (Kidderminster, [1808]), p. 275 (18 November 1761).

<sup>21</sup> For a detailed contemporary account of copyright cases, see the various injunctions, especially Millar v. Taylor, in EUL: MSS (Laing Div. II, no. 705); also The Question concerning Literary Property determined by the Court of King's Bench on 20th April, 1769, in the cause between Andrew Millar and Robert Taylor, edited by Sir James Burrow (London, 1773).



what the rights of an author or editor were in relation to the bookseller), whereas Millar fought to secure the bookseller's copyright in common law in order to protect literary property from pirates. Warburton decried the malpractices of the trade, such as the bookseller's habit of depriving the author of the benefits of a second edition which was inevitably advertised as being 'improved' - buyers of the first edition would feel cheated in retrospect, blaming the author for diminishing the value of their purchase, while the bookseller created a greater demand for the second edition and enhanced his own profits.<sup>22</sup> Warburton's thesis turns into a rhetorical defence which is somewhat obscured by his own interests in proposing that the 'doctrine' of a book ought to be protected as well as the copyright. The gist of his argument is:

If an Author have only a Property in his individual Manuscript, he hath, truly speaking, no Property, in his Book, at all; that is, as his Book is a Work of the Mind; which, in this Case, still lies in common. The Consequence is . . . That no Property ariseth from a Thing susceptible of Property: Nay, which is still more absurd, from a Thing actually become Property; as being attended with all those essential Conditions from whence Property ariseth. To deny an Author, therefore, or his Assigns, an exclusive Privilege to print and vend his own Work, seemeth to be a Violation of one of the most fundamental Rights of Civil Society.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Warburton, Works, 7 vols (London, [1788]), VII, 926-27.

<sup>23</sup> Warburton, Works, VII, 930-31.



Millar would have had little time for Warburton's notion of the doctrine<sup>of</sup> in literary property, ideas being impossible to copyright, although he was the most effective agent of his day in terms of giving both authors and readers what they most wanted - financial success on one hand, a good read on the other. Millar pursued his litigations up until the end of his career. Indeed, his death is recorded early in the proceedings of The Question concerning Literary Property in the case of Millar versus Taylor. The King's Bench upheld Millar's claim on 20 April 1769, which was:

'That there is a real Property remaining in Authors, after Publication of their Works; and that they ONLY, or Those who claim under them, have a Right to multiply the Copies of such their literary Property, at their Pleasure, for Sale. . . . That this Right is a Common Law Right, which always has existed, and does still exist, independent of and not taken away by the Statute of 8 Ann. c. 19.<sup>24</sup>

The counsel for the defendant argued that there was no such right and that a book, once it was sold, became the sole property of the purchaser who could do with it what he or she wanted. This included reproducing the book and reselling it. If the buyer were denied that right, as

<sup>24</sup>The Question concerning Literary Property, edited by Sir James Burrow (London, 1773), p. 2.

Taylor's solicitor maintained, then the original book-seller would have a monopoly, whereas the buyer had the jus fruendi et disponendi.

Millar's solicitor offered various reasons (some of them bearing on textual fidelity) why it would be a grave situation if an author were to lose personal copyright:

The Author may not only be deprived of any Profit, but lost the Expence he has been at. He is no more Master of the Use of his own Name. He has no Control over the Correctness of his own Work. He can not prevent Additions. He can not retract Errors. He can not amend; or cancel a faulty Edition. Any One may print, pirate, and perpetuate the Imperfections, to the Disgrace and against the Will of the Author; may propagate Sentiments under his Name, which he disapproves, repents and is ashamed of. He can exercise no Discretion as to the Manner in which, or the Persons by whom his Work shall be published.<sup>25</sup>

One of the examples cited in this regard was the publication of Pope's letters to Swift:

Dean Swift was certainly the Proprietor of the Paper upon which Pope's Letters to Him were written. I know, Mr. Pope had no Paper upon which they were written; and a very imperfect Memory of their Contents: which made Him the more anxious to stop their Publication——; Knowing that the Printer had got them.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup>The Question concerning Literary Property, p. 116.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

Morally, artistically, and bibliographically, the case for the plaintiff was very persuasive, although in light of recent scholarship,<sup>27</sup> Murray might have chosen a more water-tight example than the printing of Pope's letters. Had he lived, Andrew Millar would have been pleased with the verdict, but not for long. In the case of Donaldson versus Becket in 1774, the new Attorney-General, Lord Thurlow, overthrew Murray's decision which quashed the booksellers' hopes of guaranteeing perpetual copyright through legislation. Thomas Becket, who had purchased a share of Millar's copyright of Thomson's Seasons, could not now prevent Alexander Donaldson (who had Boswell as his solicitor) from selling his Edinburgh reprints of the Seasons in London.<sup>28</sup> The Bookseller's Bill was defeated in the House of Lords; the monopolist grip of the congers was losing strength, and the newer members of the growing trade were granted more mobility. Copyright was - and still is - a nebulous area of the law. Directly imitating someone else's product, whether it be a book, a typewriter, or a video-film, is at once outrageous to the offended and an exercise of free enterprise to the offender.

Millar's grievance was understandable: he encouraged writers through greater payments and then saw their works

<sup>27</sup>For the most up-to-date account of the publication of Pope's letters, see the Ph.D. thesis of my colleague, Wendy L. Jones, 'The Contemporary Context of Alexander Pope's Correspondence', University of Edinburgh, 1984.

<sup>28</sup>See Catherine Coogan Ward and Robert E. Ward, 'Literary Piracy in the Eighteenth-century Book Trade: the cases of George Faulkner and Alexander Donaldson', Factotum, no. 17 (November 1983), pp. 25-35; p. 30.

copied, reprinted and sold at a cheaper price without benefit either to the writers or himself. He assiduously built up his own stable, and now others were stealing his prime stock. Still, his career was exemplary and lucrative. What Pat Rogers writes in connection with William Strahan's career might equally be applied to Millar's:

Publishers are commonly depicted in literature as rogues or charlatans; it is pleasant to observe that men like Strahan did as much giving as taking, and contributed significantly to some of the great moments in Western civilization. A midwife for the muse of Hume, Johnson, Gibbon and Smith deserves to be remembered: the gynaecology<sup>29</sup> of genius is an art we appear to be losing.

Millar published the first two names of the abovementioned foursome, while his apprentice and successor, Thomas Cadell, saw Decline and Fall and Wealth of Nations through the press and to their readership in collaboration with Strahan. Without Millar's organizational skills, shrewd public relations, and blend of cajoling, urging and goading, Johnson's Dictionary might have taken years longer to become a formidable reality. He was certainly the kind of publisher one would want if one's first literary or philosophic creation had fallen 'dead-born from the press'.

Although Millar had little to do with the publication

<sup>29</sup> See 'Introduction: the writer and society' in the book also edited by Pat Rogers, The Context of English Literature: the Eighteenth Century (London, 1978), pp. 1-80; p. 56.

of Pope's works during the poet's life time, he helped to extend the boundaries of Pope's readership in Scotland. Records survive to show he sent copies of the Dunciad Variorum soon after it was published in 1729 to Hugh Dalrimple<sup>[sic]</sup> via the Edinburgh bookseller Alexander Symmer, and one of the Horatian imitations was forwarded to Hugh Murray of Kinnymound in 1737.<sup>30</sup> Without Millar to step in when the Knapton business plummeted in 1755, Pope's Works might have been pirated more often than they were. Millar's pragmatic approach to the literature he published was often criticized. David Hume complained to Adam Smith, 'You see what a Son of the Earth that is, to value Books only by the Profit they bring him',<sup>31</sup> but Millar put the profits back into their source - the writers.

In his will Millar left £200 to Hume. He also left bequests of £200 each for Fielding's sons, William and Allen. His fortune amounted to well over £10,000.<sup>32</sup> Like the Knaptons', Millar's name disappeared from imprints after his death. The heir to his business, Thomas Cadell, eventually published Warburton's posthumous Works (1788) and Letters from a late Eminent Prelate (1808), both edited by Hurd. Warburton left most of his fortune to the church.

<sup>30</sup>NLS: MSS.12950.ff.149, 162. <sup>31</sup>NLS: MSS.3942.f.35.

<sup>32</sup>A transcript of Millar's will, based on the copy proved at the prerogative Court of Canterbury on 17 June 1768, is kept in the Scottish Public Records Office (CC8/125/2).

Copyright Problems: Translation Rights & Scottish Publishing

Not entirely unlike the video pirates of today, the entrepreneurs of the eighteenth-century book trade found many loopholes in legislation regarding copyright. The planners of the Act of 1710 did not envisage the problems which might arise between the owner of a literary copyright and someone who wanted to steal a part of the 'property'. The notion of literature as a property was debated throughout the century, as was the question of the right to perpetual copyright through common law.

The permutations of a single, original work were complex. Pope might make a good deal of money out of translating Homer, but what if someone were to print his translation in a different country in a slightly different way? This is indeed what happened with the Iliad. Thomas Johnson flooded the London market with a cheaper edition from his presses in The Hague.<sup>1</sup> But the financial loss was Lintot's, not Pope's. Apart from tightening control over imports and punishing vendors of pirated goods, there was little to be done. William Hogarth realized the need for more comprehensive legislation when, in 1724, he underwent the chastening exper-

<sup>1</sup>George Sherburn, The Early Career of Alexander Pope (Oxford, 1934; rpt. 1968), pp. 188-89.



ience of having his Masquerades and Operas pirated, then seeing copies sold at half the price of his original in the same shop, and finally being handed the remainder of his 'popular' print back with a proprietorial shrug. It took him a long time, but a copyright act for engravers - known as Hogarth's Act - was passed in May 1735.<sup>2</sup>

The anonymous writer of An Enquiry into the Nature and Origin of Literary Property put forward a question which might be applied to any one who edits (as well as translates) another's works: 'If the true and peculiar Property in the Book is inherent in the Ideas, and is gained by Improvement, whence arises the Right of the Translator?'<sup>3</sup> This pamphlet is in fact a reply to Warburton's Letter from an Author, to a Member of Parliament, concerning Literary Property (which put forward the case for perpetual copyright by common law, in other words, asking for legislation which would be of the utmost advantage to a person in Warburton's position). The writer of the later Enquiry gave a specific example of how the present copyright law is apparently unfair:

LET us put the Case stronger. Suppose a grave and perhaps a reverend Commentator had discovered in the Dust of some old

<sup>2</sup>See Ronald Paulson, Hogarth, His Life, Art and Times, 2 vols (New Haven, 1971), I, 119.

<sup>3</sup>[Anon] An Enquiry into the Nature and Origin of Literary Property (London, 1762), p. 5. Erroneously attributed to Warburton in EUL catalogue.

Library, a Manuscript of Menander; with what Extasy would he seize this valuable Acquisition? What a Field of Criticism would it discover to him? much learned Pains would be employed on the Punctuation; many refined Conjectures and verbal criticisms would be displayed on the Text. At length it is published. The Editor could not even in this Copy derive to himself an exclusive Right by Occupancy or Improvement; nor can the King grant to him the sole Right of printing it for a Term of Years; because he is not the Inventor, nor is it of a Publick Nature and Importance, relating it to the Good and Benefit of the Subject.<sup>4</sup>

The writer continued to argue that 'Copy was not susceptible of Property' and that perpetual copyright 'has been proved prejudicial to the Advancement of Letters, and of ill Consequence to Authors themselves'.<sup>5</sup> When it came right down to defining the boundaries of a literary property, the writer found it a contradiction: 'The very Notion of an original incorporeal Right is inconsistent with the necessary Qualification of Property.' The summation went thus:

FAR be it from me to deprive the INGENIOUS of the Fruits of their Wit and Industry; may they long enjoy every Advantage, every reasonable Encouragement. Let not the Sources of the Common Law be corrupted, nor its Principles be perverted, in Support of a Right, prejudicial

<sup>4</sup>An Enquiry into the Nature and Origin of Literary Property, p. 7.

<sup>5</sup>An Enquiry, p. 37.

to the Cause of Literature, which it is calculated to promote.<sup>6</sup>

Towards the end of Pope's life the situation for authors had been improved somewhat. An Act for Prohibiting the Importation of Books re-printed Abroad, and first composed or written, and printed in Great Britain (1739) would have helped to discourage publishing pirates from following the same path as Thomas Johnson. Still, piracies occurred, and Pope's works being popular literature, the continued interest of outside booksellers was inevitable. It is difficult to assess the extent of damage to the established trade done by pirates as few figures are available on the number of pirated editions. David Foxon has suggested, regarding Pope's works, that piracies were more frequent than previously imagined by Griffith.<sup>7</sup>

For Warburton, problems of copyright were made even more complex by virtue of the fact that he was the first literary executor in English legal history who stood to make a substantial amount of money for his labours. It was a unique position to occupy, and without precedents

<sup>6</sup>An Enquiry, p. 39.

<sup>7</sup>David Foxon, Thoughts on the History and Future of Bibliographical Description (Los Angeles, 1970), p. 21: 'we shall not in most cases know who printed a book until we have worked out who owned the woodcut ornaments used in the period. . . . some fifty octavo editions of important poems with London imprints are in fact Edinburgh piracies, apparently published by Allan Ramsay. Griffith's bibliography of Pope, for example, is consequently frequently in error.' See also his English Verse 1701-1750.

the bounds of Warburton's 'property' and the extent to which it should be protected were difficult to determine. What, for example, if someone wanted to 'borrow' a part of the Pope canon for a translation or reprint Pope's Works for a readership which was outside the range of London distribution?

These two problems are not as hypothetical as they might sound: Warburton was confronted with both in 1754. In both cases Warburton eventually granted permission which shows a degree of reasonableness not many critics are willing to acknowledge. Warburton might easily have withheld his permission in both cases, although either correspondent wanting to reprint Pope's text might have gone ahead without much legal obstruction. On the face of it, both borrowers wrote for permission out of courtesy; but perhaps Warburton's connection with the then Attorney-General (1754-56), William Murray (to whom Pope dedicated Epistle I vi which Warburton singled out with fulsome praise as 'the most finished of all his imitations'),<sup>8</sup> may have encouraged them to go through proper channels. In the decade following Pope's death there were numerous editions and translations which would have been published without any authorization from Warburton whatsoever. Presumably the Latin translations by James Kirkpatrick ([1745]) and

<sup>8</sup>Pope, Works, IV (1751), 124n.

Usher Gahagan (1747) of the Essay on Criticism, as well as those of the Temple of Fame and Messiah by 'A.B.', went ahead without any regard for Warburton's proprietorial rights.<sup>9</sup> The two parties whose request for permission is documented in the correspondence had previously published Pope's text apparently without assuming they needed Warburton's authorization. Whether it was regarded simply as a formality or pressure over copyright infringement was mounting, John Sayer and Robert Foulis saw fit to apply for permission.

At the same time as his heated correspondence with Andrew Millar over the publication of Bolingbroke's Works, Warburton received a letter from the Reverend Mr John Sayer, M.A., asking for permission to publish Pope's text of the third epistle of the Essay on Man alongside his Latin verse translation.<sup>10</sup> Sayer had approached Knapton first who advised him to write to Warburton in Prior Park. His translation had been advertised as early as the spring of 1752, so the borrowing of Pope's original text would have been a fait accompli (unless the translation was suppressed or delayed for two years).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See Foxon P821, 'Translations'; K88; G6. Also, Gentleman's Magazine, XIX (1749), Jan. and Feb. book lists.

<sup>10</sup> See Egerton 1954.f.76 (26 January 1754) below.

<sup>11</sup> London Magazine, XXI (March and April 1752), 195: 'Mr. Pope's third Essay on Man: Translated into Latin Verse. By J. Sayer, M.A., pr. 2s. 6d. Rivingtons.' Pope's text is printed in the footnotes of the 1752 quarto. (BL: 11658.h.23)

At least two of the names on the 1752 imprint of Sayer's translation were potential intruders on Warburton's property: Mary Cooper's 1757 Supplement to Pope's works added pieces to the canon Warburton was happier to forget (like Sober Advice); and William Owen's 1749 edition of An Essay on Criticism made use of Warburton's notes (as well as his name) more than likely without his consent.

But when Warburton wrote to Knapton enclosing Sayer's request and his own reply for Knapton's perusal, he was unaware of Sayer's 1752 edition. To Sayer's 'Unacquaintance with the Nature of Literary Property' Warburton answers that he has taken legal action over a half dozen piracies of the Essay on Man, although, so far, no records have been found to substantiate Warburton's claim.<sup>12</sup> Still, Warburton does not refuse to grant permission; rather, he leaves the decision up to Knapton.<sup>13</sup>

Eventually Warburton allows Sayer to have five hundred copies of his translation printed. He is even willing to have his name put down on the subscription list, although he candidly admits to having no power of influence to persuade others to do the same. When Sayer wishes for a larger impression, Warburton firmly puts his foot down. Warburton is concerned lest others take Sayer's translation as a

<sup>12</sup>My enquiry into Warburton's litigation in the Index of Chancery depositions at the Society of Genealogists has yet to uncover anything. No mention of Warburton is made in R.J. Goulden's Some Chancery Lawsuits: 1714-1758.

<sup>13</sup>See Egerton 1954.f.78 (28 January 1754).



carte blanche to reprint other Pope texts freely.

Furthermore, Warburton demands that notice be given of his express permission so that anyone contemplating another parallel translation will consult him first. Sayer has argued that his project will in no way interfere with Warburton's property and goes so far as to suggest that his translation may serve to enhance Pope's reputation (perhaps hinting that more Warburton editions might be sold as a result of his publication). Warburton reacts very coldly to this suggestion: 'Nor do I think Mr P.s fame, which I should be always desirous of promoting, at all concerned in the matter. If you translate the Poem well, the reputation will be yours; if it be without Success, he loses nothing by the miscarriage.'<sup>14</sup> Yet in spite of his damp squibs and admonitory tones, Warburton yielded to Sayer's request to 'borrow' an epistle from the Essay on Man. Perhaps Warburton felt it would do more harm than good not to grant Sayer's wish; the last thing he might have wanted at this stage was one more literary plaintiff. Or, perhaps implicitly Warburton was amenable to seeing the completion of the project Pope once hoped Christopher Smart would do.<sup>15</sup> Whatever factors influenced Warburton, a small impression of a Latin-English Essay on

<sup>14</sup> See Egerton 1954.f.87 (4 March 1754) below.

<sup>15</sup> See Correspondence, IV, 478 (6 November 1743) and 483 (18 November [1743]). Pope suggested Smart try his hand at translating the fourth epistle. Various contemporary translations are cited by Pope (p. 484).

Man was not bound to prejudice sales of Warburton's small octavo edition of the Essay, some five thousand copies of which had been printed between 1745 and 1748 alone.<sup>16</sup> Sayer followed up his Essay on Man translation with a Latin-English text of the Universal Prayer in 1756 ('Impensis W. Owen') which was advertised early in 1757 as being 'By T. Sayer, M.A.'.<sup>17</sup> Again, the impression he made would have been a fairly modest one.

The second request for permission to reprint Pope's works was a much more complex issue. Here Warburton was dealing with a professional bookseller, and his decision might have far-reaching consequences. The problem of Scottish publishing had to be handled stealthily from both sides of the border. Andrew Millar's test-case over copyright in the Edinburgh Court of Session from 1738-39 and later from 1743-49 demonstrated the exhausting and costly nature of legal proceedings which, in the long-run, did nothing to eliminate piracy (although the action itself may have discouraged some publishers from continuing its practice). If a Paisley-born, Edinburgh-apprenticed London bookseller had little luck curbing the habits of his compatriot tradesmen, what could a part-time editor bent on becoming a bishop (and quietly residing at Prior

<sup>16</sup>K.I.D. Maslen, 'New Editions of Pope's Essay on Man 1745-48', PBSA, 62 (1968), pp. 177-88.

<sup>17</sup>London Magazine, XXVI (January and February 1757), p. 104.

Park with a residence in Gloucester as well) hope to accomplish?

Scots publishers felt they had good reason to re-print English texts. Printing, many thought, was more elegantly and correctly done north of the border. Why should a buyer in Scotland have to pay an inflated price (which included transportation and storage) for a book which could be produced much cheaper locally? Finally, in the spirit of Thomas Johnson (who had the active support of Professor Charles Mackie of the University of Edinburgh in the smuggling of sheets from The Hague)<sup>18</sup> Scottish booksellers rebelled against the London monopoly. After Millar abandoned his action against twenty-nine Scottish booksellers in 1739 over the piracy of Thomson's Seasons (which must have seemed an ironical situation all round), they were eager to test further boundaries.

In 1744 Robert Urie of Glasgow came out with an edition of the Spectator which sold for a few shillings less than the cheapest London retail price. Reaction from down south was swift:

Getting notice of a beautiful Edition of the Spectator printed in Glasgow, and proposed to be sold at eleven Shillings, which is three Shillings cheaper than ever this Book has been sold in England, the Londoners

<sup>18</sup> See EUL, MSS: La.II. Johnson, from The Hague, asks Macky [sic], then in London, 'If you come pray bring me the 5th & 6th vols. of Homer [i.e. Pope's] fol. stich'd up but not b[oun]d. & what other books...' (23 August 1720).

have sent down 1000 Copies, which they offer to sell at the Rate of ten Shillings and sixpence the Book. They can afford to throw away some Money; and they are willing to beat down and ruin a Competitor.<sup>19</sup>

This plea made by a group of Edinburgh and Glasgow book-sellers on 3 December 1744 attacked the London monopoly, naming Millar as an agent of this iniquity. Robert and Andrew Foulis were not involved with the above protest as they had been associated with Millar for a number of years and had worked on a dozen editions together between 1741 and 1744.<sup>20</sup> Nonetheless, the Foulis brothers must have felt the constraints upon publishing from London.

They also may have felt the growing competition in Scotland itself. When they eventually printed and published an edition of the Essay on Man in 1751, another Glasgow edition appeared under the imprint of William Duncan junior. Again, the Foulis brothers came out with a small octavo Essay on Man in 1754, and William Duncan junior followed suit in 1755. A variation on this theme occurred when Robert Urie's 1750 Four Ethic Epistles was answered by Four Ethic Epistles in opposition to Pope under the Paterson imprint in the following year.

<sup>19</sup>David Murray, Robert & Andrew Foulis and the Glasgow Press (Glasgow, 1913), p. 43.

<sup>20</sup>See Philip Gaskell, 'Early Work of the Foulis Press and the Wilson Foundry', The Library, 5th series, vol. 7 (1952), pp. 77-110; 149-77. See also his Bibliography of the Foulis Press (London, 1964).

Warburton was given advance warning of Foulis's intention of printing an edition of Pope's works and sent a letter to the Scottish printer in the autumn of 1754.<sup>21</sup> Foulis's reply was succinct; one sentence informed Warburton that he was referring the matter to the Attorney-General. William Murray had long been a friend and legal adviser of both Pope and Warburton. He had helped Pope with copyright problems from 1737 (when James Watson pirated an edition of the Letters)<sup>22</sup> and had given Warburton the benefit of his consultations when Collet Mawhood proved to be troublesome as the executor of his deceased bookseller, Fletcher Gyles, in 1742.<sup>23</sup> But Murray had also acted as counsel for Glasgow University which awarded him the honorary degree of LL.D. in 1754, so Murray (who was also a collector of fine books) would have been aware of the prestige connected with the Foulis imprint.<sup>24</sup> It seems, however, judging by Foulis's letter to Murray, that the two men were not directly acquainted.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Foulis's brief letter of 27 November 1754 to Warburton is 'in answer to yours'. Warburton's original letter to Foulis seems not to have survived. See also David Murray, Robert & Andrew Foulis, pp. 44-46, which contains a facsimile of Foulis's letter.

<sup>22</sup>Correspondence, IV, 87 and 425.

<sup>23</sup>Correspondence, IV, 385-87, 410-11, 427, 455.

<sup>24</sup>David Murray, Robert & Andrew Foulis, p. 45.

<sup>25</sup>See Egerton 1959.f.20 (20 December 1754). Foulis offers two names of reference, Lords Selkirk and Cathcart, although these may have been included for Warburton's sake.

Murray appointed a solicitor by the name of George Ross to look into the possibility of bringing an action against Foulis to stop the publication of Pope's works. Ross, in turn, retained a solicitor in Edinburgh, one Ronald Crawford, to look into the matter. Crawford wrote a long, complicated, and ultimately equivocal letter to Ross on 28 November 1754.<sup>26</sup> The Edinburgh solicitor begins by saying he has not yet been able to consult with the Lord Advocate, then suggests why such a meeting might be premature: 'on considering a little more on this affair, I find myself without sufficient Materials, for carrying on this Prosecution.' He needs various documents - an official proving of Pope's will, certificates of entry <sup>from</sup> Stationers' Hall - before proceeding.

Crawford proceeds to examine the clauses in Pope's will relating to Warburton, emphasizing that Pope 'only gives the Doctor, such Books as he hath written, or shall write Commentaries upon, which he has not otherwise disposed of or alienated'. There may be a loop-hole here: 'This seems to imply as if Mr Pope had alienated the property of some of his Works.' Crawford therefore asks that a 'particular List or Schedule of such part of the Works as Dr Warburton apprehends to be his property' be

<sup>26</sup> Egerton 1959. ff. 23-24 (in Appendix A).



sent to him. He then looks at Pope's literary property in relation to the 1710 Copyright Act, noting that some of Pope's 'puerilities' precede that date. Further complications might arise from distinguishing between an author's privilege (in fourteen-year terms) and a literary executor's: 'yet I have a doubt if on his Death, such a Privilege is assignable for what part of the 2<sup>d</sup> term may be then to run. It seems to be only personal, to the Author himself, but not to his Executors or Assigns'.

One thing Crawford's letter does make clear is that Warburton does not intend to sue Foulis 'for the Penalties' (which are the destruction of every sheet found in the transgressor's custody and a fine of a penny per sheet found). Rather, Warburton is suing 'for Damages, and to stop the printing', damages presumably meaning the estimated loss in revenue to Warburton caused by the Foulis edition. Warburton does not want to invoke the full measure of the law; he simply wants what he regards as fair compensation for impositions on his property. In theory, Warburton has a case, but in practice the proceedings could be quite laborious, technically arcane (even to someone with Warburton's legal background), and fruitless. Crawford seems ominously stodgy with a plea of ignorance which might mask incompetence or unwillingness to proceed in a case on behalf of London booksellers against Scotland's most respected printers:

We are very much Strangers here to the particulars of the Laws in relation to the property of Books. It came to be lookt into a little in the Action you mention, that Andrew Millar and the Booksellers of London brought against the Booksellers of Edinburgh. But as it must be well understood in England, where it is so much a matter of property, and where many Actions must have been brought, I think it would be right that D<sup>r</sup> Warburton laid his Case before the Attorney General, for opinion, that he transmit such opinion for our Government and direction, together with such Title (if he has established it) as entitles him. . . .<sup>27</sup>

In other words, the whole affair promises to be a blueprint for Bleak House. Even before initial investigations have gotten under way, Crawford complains to his Conduit Street counterpart, Ross, that until every last document appears before his eyes 'it is putting us to an unnecessary Expence at present'. By the end of his repetitious preamble, Crawford decides to postpone in meeting with the Lord Advocate. He is right to do so in retrospect, as the action will never take place, yet he is also part of the reason why the matter will be forgotten. The letter (which probably ended up in Warburton's hands after being copied out) would have left an intimation of hopelessness in seeking any form of redress. Murray, after consulting with Ross, would have urged Warburton to drop any proceed-

<sup>27</sup> Egerton 1959.ff.23-24.

ings before they turned into a nightmare of bureaucratic eternity:

And quick to swallow me, methought I saw  
One of our Giant Statutes ope its Jaw.<sup>28</sup>

On 6 December 1754, by which time a bundle of letters had accumulated, Warburton was willing to leave the matter up to Knapton. As Foulis had expressed a willingness to lay aside his edition, Warburton recommended leniency: 'as they are willing to desist one would make the terms of submission as easy to them as we can.' As Pope's editor (who had a joint share with his bookseller), he was more than pleased with Murray's support. Ample protection implicit in Murray's correspondence would benefit literature as well as secure Warburton's and Knapton's proprietorship: 'I am sure you will rejoice in the attorney's Letter as it is relative to all property and as he seems to make it a point to establish it for the good of Letters.'

Foulis broached the subject of perpetual copyright in common law in his letter to Murray on 20 December 1754. He deferentially points out the problems this doctrine causes in Scotland. On one hand a Scottish printer wants to produce books which will enhance learning in his area by filling a need which is not completely met by London shipments;

<sup>28</sup> Donne IV, Twickenham IV, pp. 39-40 (ll. 172-73).

on the other hand he needs to make a reasonable profit if he is going to stay in the business of printing. The Foulis press enjoyed special privileges under the auspices of Glasgow University, but even so, the proposed doctrine would deny most Scottish printers and publishers the right to print any modern English text. Milton's Paradise Lost was a case in point: it 'could not only have been printed in Scotland until the Union of the Kingdoms, but even to the last Act of Queen Anne'. But the new doctrine would discourage rather than encourage learning. Foulis's enlightened ideals must have struck Warburton as laudable; and the irony of the fact that a Scottish edition of Shakespeare's works was not published until 1753 might have struck an English editor as unjust.

Foulis points out that he has only printed a small part of Pope's works and is willing to discontinue the project and sell his stock at a loss to students. If Warburton is not averse to his plans, he will print an impression of one thousand copies and forward whatever proportion he thinks fit to have. This seemed the best plan to Murray who enclosed Foulis's letter in his own to Warburton on 28 December 1754. Warburton, in turn, relayed this advice to Knapton two days later. If all parties agreed - Warburton, Knapton, and Murray - then Foulis should be given permission. A fortnight later, Warburton expressed his

relief to Knapton in not having to embark on a protracted law suit: 'To tell you truth I neither like Law litigations, nor soliciting my friends to secure my property of this kind, besides I could do this with a better grace, as well as more readiness for another than for my selfe.' Fifteen years earlier, Pope expressed a similar sentiment to Warburton over not having to protect his reputation by himself.

This letter of 12 January 1755 hints at Warburton's weariness with the struggle of being owner of a much prized literary property. The continuous attacks on his editorial abilities, the constant need to assert his ownership of Pope copyright, the signs of change in the London publishing structure, all seem to have descended upon Warburton within a short span of time. He has more than fulfilled his obligations to his deceased friend and now perhaps longs for a quiet withdrawal from the London literary circle:

All this considered I have thought when we settled all matters abt Pope to dispose of my property in it, of which you may be sure you should have the refusal: nor shall I ever be the less warm to assist you at all times to the best of my power to the better security of your property.

Throughout these trials on his patience and energy, Warburton has displayed a level of tolerance not many critics

from Stephen to Bateson have been willing to accord him. Warburton for all his faults and relatively minor mishaps with Pope's texts could be a reasonable man under adverse conditions. He did not have to grant permission to Sayer or Foulis; he did not have to sell part of his share in Pope to Andrew Millar (whom he apparently mistrusted on moral grounds), nor did he have to maintain fairly close contact with John Knapton; but he saw the practical, economical, common sense values in doing so. In taking an interest in Pope's works, not only from the textual point of view, but also from the finer points of production, Warburton ensured that Pope's name would be well perpetuated through the many thousands of sets of Pope's Works within a decade after his death.

. . . . .



Entr'acte

I am reticent about applying the word 'conclusion' to my efforts, especially when so much material is still to come. Undoubtedly there is more to uncover about the Knaptons. My appeal for information in the Times Literary Supplement (9 March 1984) has produced but one reply - and that from an old academic crony - to date (10 April 1984). There are sources I wish, given time, energy and expenses, I might have exploited more. For example, I have relied on Maynard Mack's research and correspondence with the part-time archivist for information about Bishop Hurd's library (which includes many books owned by Pope, Warburton and Allen); and, having made several attempts to consult Graham Cartwright's thesis which catalogues Hurd's collection, I have conceded (for the time being) to a bureaucratic defeat.

I should also have made more use of other sources, such as the John Butt papers at Oxford, the John Johnson collection, the Guildhall Library. . . . But, for the present, I have amassed enough documentation in the appendices to keep me busy for some time to come. In thumbing through Bateson this morning, I find a note on Sherburn who 'has seen letters from Murray to Martha Blount' (III ii xiii). Where are these now? They might help pinpoint the date of three querulous letters from Warburton to Knapton which follow (Egerton 1954. ff. 3-7). Gaps abound, but what I have filled in I hope will enhance our knowledge of the eighteenth-century book trade.

. . . . .

P.S.: I have little to dispute with Claude Rawson when he says, 'Pope is now perhaps the most richly and accurately edited poet in the language.'<sup>1</sup> Apart from Shakespeare (who was a 'word-man' of a slightly different order), Pope has been subject to the greatest array of editorial treatment and has attracted the life-long gaze of the most eminent scholars, one of whom I have especially acknowledged. I hope what I have done has amplified Rawson's 'perhaps'. There are some editorial knots which will remain untied simply because the author's intentions have been unclear. Pope was perfectly - which is to say imperfectly - aware of the vicissitudes of the human mind; the perfect page might still be re-punctuated. I had, at one stage, hoped to show how Pope had been presented differently by different editors - how Pattison had removed the 'indecencies' and Rossetti left them in. The response of editors to shifting ideologies still interests me, but such a project will probably be stored away and forgotten now. Still, the Pope tercentenary awaits. . . .

I forgot to add Warburton's entanglements with Henry Lintot and Robert Dodsley which are mentioned in the later correspondence. As Pope's editor he was eventually granted exclusive copyright: 'A royal licence gave Warburton the sole right to print, publish and vend the Works which he had

<sup>1</sup>'The work of rehabilitation', Times Literary Supplement (13 April 1984), p. 412 [rev. of Mack's Collected in Himself].

annotated for 14 years from 24 July 1759.<sup>2</sup> Although Warburton would have commanded a fair percentage of the profits for his editorial labours - his royalties as an editor must represent another first in the business of literature - his life, as we have already witnessed, was not made easy as a result of Pope's legacy. As editor he suffered the worst indignations imaginable in print.

If the British have neglected Warburton - has there been a serious attempt to establish his influence on the literary circles of his time? - at least he seems to be gaining in stature elsewhere. Robert M. Ryley's book on Warburton is due to be published any day now in America. Maynard Mack's forthcoming biography will no doubt have much to say about Pope's association with Warburton. The most recent reprinting of a Warburtonian text seems to have been in France. Perhaps one of Rawson's comments will provide a clue: he points out 'how the crypto-metaphorical activity of allusions, puns, mock-heroic effects and irony operates in Pope in the extended articulation of an entire poem rather than in the individual elaboration of single metaphorical images'. This might explain the enigmatic presence of Jacques Derrida in the preface to Essai sur les hiéroglyphes des Égyptiens.<sup>3</sup> The wild Scriblerian abandon of 'e's' in a word like 'Shakspear'

<sup>2</sup> Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, II, 1660-1800, ed. F.W. Bateson (Cambridge, 1969), p. 294.

<sup>3</sup> Traduit par Léonard des Malpeines, édition et notes par Patrick Tort, précédé de SCRIBBLE (pouvoir/écrire) par Jacques Derrida (Paris, 1977).

(or my own discursive examination of Pope's 'P's') is just the sort of thing to set a man like Derrida off on a Shandean stream of association:

C'est à cette complication supplémentaire du scribble que je voudrais en venir, avec un b de plus. Le double b renvoie à la langue originale de l'auteur, biensûr (to scribble, c'est faire métier d'écrire et plutôt à la hâte, à l'économie; mais c'est aussi, autre séparation critique, carder la laine, en française le scriblage. (7)

The difference between Warburtonian 'incrustation' and canonical significance might seem fairly slim, but to Derrida, rejoicing in the mist left by Finnegans Wake, it imparts a new grammar. The act of writing about writing (which all editors must plainly do) is a self-defeating one. The more cryptic Warburton is, the higher Derrida regards him as a writer. Out of the 'scribledyhole' crawls a new declension: grille (the confessional); crible (separating the wheat from the chaff); scribe (one who separates good words from bad); and, the verb which most alarmed Pope: scrible. When Derrida repeats his theme - 'Comment lire, ici, Warburton?' - we might add to it the image of Warburton as a sort of Lear on the Heath of his commentaries. Having begun this in a Shandean mode, might we end with Yorick's 'A COCK and a BULL'? I can only hope the Papal dispensation is sound, 'And one of the best of its kind, I ever heard.' Bien merci!

**APPENDIX A**

**A BOOK-TRADE CORRESPONDENCE:**

**WARBURTON, KNAPTON AND OTHERS**

## APPENDIX A: A BOOK-TRADE CORRESPONDENCE

Warburton and John Knapton must have begun corresponding in earnest not long after Pope specifically recommended this prestigious bookseller to his editor-to-be late in 1741. When Warburton's bookseller, Fletcher Gyles, died on 8 November Pope was quick to write Warburton that there was no bookseller who had 'so good a title in that Character to succeed him, as Mr Knapton'. Thus began a long and prolific relationship which culminated a decade later in the first posthumous edition of Pope's Works.

The following correspondence runs from the year after Pope's death through the first five posthumous editions up to the failing of the Knapton business in 1755. Most of the letters have been transcribed from the Egerton collection (nos. 1954 and 1959) in the Students' Room of the British Library Department of Manuscripts. Other letters have been selected from Additional Manuscripts in the BL; Edinburgh University Library (EUL); and the National Library of Scotland (NLS). Where they help fill in gaps, I have included previously published letters from Nichols' Literary Anecdotes, Kilvert's Unpublished Papers and Hurd's Letters from a late Eminent Prelate.

I have attempted to reproduce the original letters as closely as type will allow. This includes leaving raised letters as they appear (although in some cases it is hard to tell whether a letter is raised or not). Original



spelling and punctuation have also been preserved (e.g. 'litterary Prop<sup>y</sup>'). A sentence may begin without a capital letter or end without punctuation. These pre-Shandean idiosyncrasies I hope will not be amiss. When the first letter or part of a word or name is given, I have on occasion hazarded a guess and filled in the gap using square brackets (e.g. in Egerton 1954.f.53, page 47 below, 'M<sup>r</sup> M' I take to be Andrew Millar as Warburton is talking about profits). Square brackets are also used in superscriptions to indicate whether the sender, recipient, date or place appears in the letter. In many instances the name of the recipient is not written, although his identity may be assumed from the context of the letter. When there is room for reasonable doubt, question marks have been added.

Occasionally an address will appear on the verso: 'To M<sup>r</sup> Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street London'. The first question to arise is: to which Knapton is Warburton writing? John, Paul or both? One clue is provided in Warburton's season's greetings of 1 January 1748/9 (page 16) in which he concludes, 'All here join with me in our best respects to your selfe & Mr & Mrs Knapton.' As Paul was married (and John apparently remained a bachelor), we may assume this letter has been sent to John. As Warburton also asks to have Allen's name put down for two sets of 'Mont-falcon's [sic] Antiquities of France', we might further assume that John took charge of other book orders. Again, on 22 December 1751 Warburton pays his respects to 'you &

Mr & Mrs Knapton' after mentioning he will forward his 'copy' for an edition of sermons shortly. The only letter addressed to Paul Knapton (page 50 below) concerns Warburton's need to find a new servant: he wants Mrs Knapton's advice. He also adds, 'Pray tell Mr. J. Knapton I recd his favour at Gloucester & was in hopes of receiving a specimen of the little Ed<sup>n</sup> of Pope'. John Knapton seems to have been in charge of the day-to-day running of the shop while Paul, whose wife Elizabeth brought a dowry of £5000, perhaps led a more leisurely life. Thus John Knapton is the main recipient of these letters.

As with the Pope-Warburton correspondence, the Warburton-Knapton letters are one-sided, this time in Warburton's favour. What became of Knapton's replies (some of which are mentioned by Warburton: see page 54 below) I have yet to discover. Warburton obviously kept a great number of his letters which may have passed on to Hurd, but numerous queries to Hartlebury Castle and elsewhere have produced nothing.

A full reproduction of the Egerton MSS would have been ideal; under the present circumstances, however, such a project would have swelled into a thesis of its own. Alas, time, energy and expenses are wanting, but what I have selected gives us a deeper insight into the making of posthumous Pope editions as well as Warburton's editorial responsibilities. After these two main criteria, selection has been determined by the editor's changing relationship with his bookseller.

Arrangement of the letters is chronological for the most part. I have made exceptions, and these are slight, for groupings: it makes more sense to keep the Bowyer-Warburton letters (taken from Nichols' Literary Anecdotes) together; and the sequences which deal with John Sayer and Robert Foulis, I thought best to leave intact. Occasionally one letter encloses another (or several letters). In this case, I have kept to the way they are ordered in the folio. However, in the crossbreeding of different collections, the numbers maintain only marginal significance in the ordering. In some cases where a letter has been misplaced by the original archivist, I have shifted it, usually with a note of explanation.

Asterisks denote truncated letters. I apologize for any irritation this might cause the reader, but at this stage, it is simply not possible to reproduce every letter to the full. I hope I have managed a fair compromise between Sherburn's expansiveness<sup>and</sup> Geoffrey Nuttall's paring down of the massive Doddridge correspondence. I have one other apology to make: Appendix A was photocopied before the main text of my thesis, which explains the dual pagination. I hope this does not cause too much confusion. My main intention is to give the editor-bookseller relationship a clearer focus. We now know who, for example, proof-read the Pope edition, who picked up the copy for Warburton's Shakespeare edition, and what sort of changes Warburton wanted carried out over the years.

LORD BOLINGBROKE to DAVID MALLET

25 July 1745

BL: Add. MSS. 35,588.f.91

## [Transcript]

Lord Bolingbroke in a letter to M<sup>r</sup> Mallet dated July the 25<sup>th</sup> 1745 says

"They say that Warburton talks very indecently of your humble servant, & threatens him with the terrible things he shall throw out in a Life he is writing of our poor deceased friend Pope.<sup>1</sup> I value neither the good nor the ill will of the Man; but if he has any regard for the man he flattered living, & thinks himself obliged to flatter dead, he ought to let a certain proceeding die away in silence, as I endeavour it should."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>As Sherburn points out, Warburton announced his intention of writing Pope's biography in one of the 1745 octavo editions of the Essay on Man: 'There is preparing for the Public / The LIFE of Mr. POPE, / with a / Critical Account of his Writings, / by Mr. WARBURTON.' This plan would be repeated in the 1751 Advertisement to Pope's Works although, ultimately, Warburton would leave the job to Ruffhead. See The Early Career of Alexander Pope, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>Mallet's reply follows on this transcript. The original note with Mallet's signature appears at the bottom of a letter from Warburton (presumably to Knapton) demanding Mallet's public disavowal of an 'infamous Libel'. Warburton suggests that a transcript of his letter be given to Andrew Millar to pass on to Mallet. See the following letter, Add. MSS. 4948.A.f.466.



[WARBURTON to KNAPTON?][1745?]<sup>1</sup>

MALLET to [BOLINGBROKE]

[1745?]

BL: Add. MSS. 4948.A.f.466

With regard to Mr Mallet's declaration, there is only one way to convince me he is not the author of that infamous Libel which is by taking an opportunity of disowning it publickly.—I think my honour [is] concerned that it be publickly known I had no hand in [the] Letter to Ld B[olingbroke]. merely on account of the Apollo story; and I shall do it on the first occasion. If Mr M[allet]. does not do the same with regard to this Libel I shall consider him as the [author] of it and act in consequence of that Belief. This I would desire you would let Mr Millar know, and if he chuses let him have a Transcript of what I here say.

[n.s.]

[Mallet's reply]

N.B. I never took the slightest notice of this impudent and silly threatening from Warburton. The writer I had no reason to be afraid of; the man I abhorred. A head filled with paradoxes, unproved and unproveable: a heart overflowing with virulence and the most slanderous malice. N.B. I never wrote a pamphlet, nor a sentence in any pamphlet concerning this wrong-headed, dogmatic pedant.

D. Mallet

<sup>1</sup>Or might this exchange refer to the 1749 fracas?

GEORGE LYTTTELTON to WARBURTON

2 September 1745

Kilvert, Unpublished Papers (1841), 207 Bath

Bath, Sept. 2, 1745

Dear Sir,

I came hither for a couple of days to see Mr. Pitt, and go to-morrow to London. I wish I could have been so fortunate as to find you and Mr. Allen here, or in town; but as I understand you are upon a tour that will soon bring you back to this place, and that I am not likely to meet you in London, I take the liberty to leave this for you at Mr. Allen's.

The occasion of my troubling you with it, is a report which I lately heard very confidently asserted of your designing speedily to publish a Life of Mr. Pope, in which you animadvert by way of a vindication upon the affair of Lord Bolingbroke's Papers.<sup>1</sup> Now, as I know more of that matter than I believe you do, and am very sure the stirring it more will not turn out to our friend's advantage, I earnestly advise you not to publish anything upon that delicate subject till you have had some talk with me. You will also consider how many friends you have that are also friends to Lord Bolingbroke, particularly Lord Chesterfield and Mr. Murray; and how disagreeable it would be to them to have you two engaged in any angry dispute upon a point of this nature.

I hope you will excuse my taking this freedom,

<sup>1</sup>Lyttelton is evidently referring to Bolingbroke's discovery of Pope's clandestine edition of The Idea of a Patriot King and strongly advising Warburton to let matters rest. This publishing time-bomb is set to explode in 1749.



and impute it to the sincere friendship and great esteem  
with which I am,

Dear Sir,

Your most faithful humble servant,

G. Lyttelton<sup>2</sup>

P.S.: I beg my best compliments to Mr. and Mrs. Allen.

<sup>2</sup>The second paragraph of this letter is cited in H.T. Dickinson, Bolingbroke (London, 1970), p. 281.

George Lyttelton ( or Lyttleton; 1709-73) is well-celebrated in Pope's poetry (Epistle I i 29; Dialogue I 47; Dialogue II 131). Pope also bequeathed him his marble busts of Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton and Dryden. In 1737, he was appointed the Secretary to the Prince of Wales. Lyttelton maintained a life-long interest in the arts, acting as a patron for Thomson and Mallet. Fielding immortalized him in the dedication of Tom Jones. Warburton helped Lyttelton with research for his long-delayed book on Henry II (see Kilvert, Unpublished Papers, p. 212).

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

26 August 1747

BL: Egerton.1954.f.1

[Prior Park]

Dear Sir

There is one M<sup>rs</sup> Long a Col.<sup>s</sup> Wid[ow]. living in Park Street beyond Grosvenor Square a friend of M<sup>r</sup> Allen's who sometime ago took her money of her, but now intends to pay it in. it is 2500.<sup>l</sup> 1000.<sup>l</sup> at Michmas & the remainder at Christmas. M<sup>r</sup> Allen will send you a Bill on Shelvocke<sup>l</sup> soon after Michmas for 1000.<sup>l</sup> which when you have recd he begs the favour of you to pay to M<sup>rs</sup> Long at her house & take a receipt for it & see it indorsed on the Bond.

I am putting my last hand to the Alliance between Church & State which I propose to give a new Ed.<sup>n</sup> of & would willingly have it ready before the busy time comes on. I desire it may be printed exactly in the same manner in all respects with the letter concerning litterary [sic] Prop<sup>y</sup>. Both as to paper letter & form. I shall send up part of the Copy next week by Leake's parcel, & only wait for some papers from M<sup>r</sup> Yorke to finish the rest. I think to dedicate it to L<sup>d</sup> Chest[erfield].

I am D<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup> ever yours

W. Warburton

Aug<sup>t</sup> 26 1747

P.S.: I have corrected a copy of my Shakespear which you may tell M<sup>r</sup> Draper is at his service whenever he requires.

<sup>l</sup>Shelvocke was the Secretary to the Post-master General.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

11 May 1748

BL: Egerton 1954.f.2.

[Prior Park?]

Dear Sir

I desire you would receive the inclosed Bill  
for my use. only letting M<sup>r</sup> Allen know this is come  
safe to hand for I am just setting out for Lincolnshire

I am extremely surprised at your long silence,  
and can account no otherwise for it than your ill health  
in which however I hope I am mistaken Being

your very assured friend &

humble Servant

W. Warburton

May 11 1748

P.S.: M<sup>r</sup> Allen desires that if [his?] two copies of  
Anson's Voyages may be bound & gilt, and if they are  
not sent already I desire you would send his by Leake's  
parcel & keep mine till I come to Towne.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

Monday evening [n.d.]

BL: Egerton 1954.f.3

[London, 1748?]<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir

I have altered my mind as to the books bought of Pope's Exec[uto]<sup>rs</sup>. I think proper to have half with Mr Draper & Mr Millar. You must deduct what you have received by the sale of part, from the sum you paid for them. and then put half the remainder on the Cred[ito]<sup>r</sup> side of my acc[oun]t. They I suppose will make no scruple to take, & pay for, the other half. This is my determination and I will be beholden to no body. I have endeavoured to consult other people's ease & profit & conveniency, & will for the future consult my own. You will remember only, that those which I sent from prior park are my own sole property.

Dear Sir your very  
affectionate Friend,

Monday evening

W. Warburton

verso: [post-mark on f.4] PENY POST PAYD Stevenson[?]

<sup>1</sup>This letter and its two companions (Egerton 1954.f.5 and ff.6-7) below are difficult to date. Perhaps the only clue as to when this transaction took place is to be found in Twickenham III ii xiii n. 3: '[Sherburn] has seen letters from Murray to Martha Blount, which show that about 1748 all the unsold copies of Pope's poems were sold by the executors to Warburton, and he thinks that the Knaptons' edition [of Four Ethic Epistles which was suppressed until 1748] may be connected with this transaction. See also Sherburn, IV 504.' This refers us to Pope's letter to Bowyer bidding him to print the epistle to Cobham in quarto instead of octavo. The end result may be seen in the British Library C.59.e.1(2).

WARBURTON to KNAPTON

[Saturday morning; n.d.]

BL: Egerton 1954.f.5

[London, 1748?]<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir

Say nothing of the contents to the bearer.

I have sold what I proposed this Morning to Mess<sup>rs</sup>  
Millar & Draper. But [I] have bit my selfe. I agreed  
as I thought to sell them in proportion as they bought  
of you & they understood me, in proportion as I had sold  
to you. I was extreme[ly] vexed: but my [honour?] was  
concerned so I have got 250<sup>l</sup> instead of 425<sup>l</sup>. All the  
satisfaction I have in this ugly affair is that you have  
got a better price. For they say they would never have  
given what they have to you but for the reason above,  
their understanding me in a sense I never thought of.

Drsr always affectionately yours.

Saturday morning

W. Warburton

---

<sup>1</sup>See Egerton 1954.f.3 (above) note 1.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

Monday morning [n.d.]

BL: Egerton 1954.ff.6-7

[London, 1748?]

Dear Sir

I wrote to you on saturday morning to let you know, how finely I was bit by my own folly. I understood I was to have in proportion as they bought of you, & they understood I was to have in proportion as I had sold to you. I don't blame them, for, I dare say, we misunderstood one another. I only blame my selfe, for not coming to a better explanation with them before. However I submitted to take all the loss of the mistake on my selfe; and for this reason; they might have said, I pretended this other meaning, different from theirs, when I found how much you had advanced upon them; and I had it not in my power to shew the contrary, because it was a matter that passed only in my own mind. And I should not care to be even suspected of so bad a thing for a much larger sum: so I executed the Deed. Not that I had intended ever to draw them up to the extent of your price, had it been left to me.—But the thing is now done & past, & I have only to look forward.

I beg you would finish my account of Pope; and draw out what I am debter to you, in that account.

As to the Books you bought of the Exec.<sup>rs</sup> you & Mr. M[illar]. & D[raper]. must adjust the disposal of them as you think fit. I think it but reasonable that



I at least should have nothing to do in them. They are part of the management of the affair which you & they undertake.

I beg I may now have this acct without delay, because I have but a very few days to stay in Town.

The other acct will be then distinct, which I hope I shall have settled too, a few days later. In the mean time they propose to take into this warehouse<sup>x</sup> all the Copies of my writings which you and I have a joint interest in. Because this is the time of year for advertising. I told them the terms they were to print for me were to be the same that I gave you. They print them at their hazard, & are to have Half the clear profits. which they think very good & generous.

I suppose you will have very little difficulty in adjusting with them the price of the claim you have in those copies: and you can have no difficulty or imbaras [sic] in drawing out my acct concerning them. I find a necessity of being thus explicite, lest I have any other mistake in my transactions with them concerning my meaning. And this would have vexed me more than it

<sup>x</sup>as to those copies of the 2<sup>d</sup> Vol. of D.L. which you bought the half of, of Mahood and which I ordered to be rendered imperfect, they will give them room too; and you will set down on the D<sup>r</sup> side of my acct of Pope, what you paid to Mahood for them.

does, but that I conclude both from the nature of the thing, and what they assured me, that the price they understood I intended to let them have the share for, which I sold them, induced them to rise so high in the purchase of yours. For nobody can wish you better than I do, nor rejoice more in the good prospect of the issue of your affairs. And I hope you are sensible of it.

I am D<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup> your very assured

& affectionate friend & humble Servt

Monday morning

W. Warburton<sup>1</sup>

P.S. I was looking over your note of 500<sup>1</sup> which, on acct of the Statute, you renewed in time. I find it bears the Date Dec<sup>r</sup> 15 1744 and bears interest, as it is expressed, after the rate of 4 p. cent. I mention this because perhaps you might be at a loss for the precise date.

<sup>1</sup>An aggravating letter in more than one sense; it almost, but not quite, helps us to date its companions (Egerton 1954. ff. 3-5). On Monday evening (f. 3) Warburton mentions changing his mind 'as to the books bought of Pope's Exec<sup>r</sup>s', Bolingbroke, Marchmont, and himself. He has decided to split his share (presumably of Pope books) with Somerset Draper and Andrew Millar. Warburton's tone is quite adamant: 'This is my determination and I will be beholden to no body.'

The next letter (f. 5) explains how Warburton has misunderstood the intricacies of the transaction and lost £175 in the exchange. Now he sounds embarrassed and begins by writing 'Say nothing of the contents to the bearer.' Warburton's loss, however, has been Knapton's gain. The £250 Warburton received may help us to date the letter, as there is a deposit of £250 in Warburton's account at Gosling's Bank on 22 November 1755. The first account referred to above may be the one drawn up by Draper in Appendix B (Egerton 1959. f. 30) some time after the 1754 Pope edition. Warburton wishes to have the remainder of the second volume of The Divine Legation destroyed in ff. 34 and 52 (9 December 1751 and 15 October 1752), although Knapton may have persuaded him to render it imperfect.

WARBURTON to WILLIAM BOWYER

1748-1751

Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, II, 228-29 [Prior Park?]

The extreme care which was taken of this edition [i.e. Pope's Works, 1751], with its progress through the press, will appear from the following curious and expostulatory letters of the learned Editor to his Printer:

Dec. 12, 1748. "Dear Sir, I have examined the Volume printed off, as to the press-work; and I must needs tell you it is miserable work, and I cannot bear to have an edition appear so badly done. Look into the books printed at Cambridge and Oxford, and you will see other sort of work. Look particularly into a very foolish book of Wood's, just printed at Oxford, on Stonehenge. But your rascals, what between knavery and villainous newspapers, do their work never fit to be read, and sometimes incapable of being read."—"Mr. Knapton tells me he has given Mr. Bowyer Brown's Poem on Satire. Why is it not yet printed? It is to be put at the head of that volume in which the Essay on Man is. Why is not the Index to the Dunciad yet printed? Send it to me by the bearer."—Oct. 14, 1749. "As to that letter of Dr. Arbuthnot to Mr. Pope in Curll's Edition, if you are sure it be genuine, I would have it in; and what else there is there that is genuine and modest."—March 9, 1749-50.

"The inclosed is the conclusion of the Introduction

corrected. I would have it worked off. To fasten the concluding loose leaf, I have sent the title-page, for there will be no advertisement to make another leaf to that I once proposed.—And to make these two leaves half a sheet, I have sent two leaves to be reprinted. I am surprized I have not yet had a proof of the first sheet, which I delivered when I was in London to be reprinted; and think myself very ill used by the neglect.—I expect what I order to be done, to be done out of hand."—March 12, 1749-50. "I have sent the inclosed, that the work may go on with all expedition. What is yet to print will make about four sheets. This (and the little copy you had before) is part. I shall insist on having two sheets composed, and sent me to correct; for I am resolved to have the book out before the end of the month. Had you condescended to do what I desired, which was, to have the first sheet re-composed with speed, the compositor would now have had nothing to do but fall to work on this. You need not fear waiting for the rest of the copy."—March 23, 1749-50. "I have sent the conclusion of the book, with a leaf to be re-printed, which is the last I shall cancel. I expect more proof this day. Sure you know the post comes every day."—May 6, 1751. "I am resolved to have Pope finished before I go out of town. Therefore I desire you to proceed with all expedition on the cancelled leaves, contents, title-pages &c. And let them be done out of hand, and have Mr. Knapton's

final direction about the title-pages directly, and without any more put-offs."—June 3, 1751. "Mr. Bowyer, I take it extremely ill of you for not sending me two copies of all the reprinted leaves, prefaces, title-pages, &c. before I left town, as I ordered. If I thought what I said would be any way regarded by you, I would have them sent by Leake's Parcel. W.W."

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

17 December 1748

BL: Egerton 1954.f.8

[Prior Park?]

Don't you think that Mrs Cockbourn's book agt Rutherford should be advertised again?<sup>1</sup> I never saw Mr Camber's [?] letter advertised above once or twice. But it might be in papers that do not come here. It is well wrote.

I am most affectionately yours

W. Warburton

Dec<sup>r</sup> 17 1748

P.S.: It is unreasonable to expect long letters from you who have such variety of Business. But do not forget that I always hear from you with great Pleasure, as there is no friend I more esteem & love.

<sup>1</sup>Mrs Catharine Cockburn (née Trotter) wrote a defence of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding in 1702. Shortly after Pope's death, she approached Warburton, asking about his theory of moral obligation in the first volume of Divine Legation. He subsequently presented her with copies of Pope's two Essays and The Dunciad (see Hurd's Discourse by Way of General Preface to Warburton's Works, p. 148). When she wrote a refutation of Rutherford's Essay on Virtue, Warburton supplied a preface and made sure that it was published. Her Remarks upon the Principles and Reasonings of Dr. Rutherford's Essay on the Nature and Obligations of Virtue was published in 1747. Warburton thinks the book is not been publicized enough. Mrs Cockburn's Works were published in two volumes by the Knaptons in 1751. (See also Watson, pp. 233-35; and Evans, pp. 127-28.) A thousand proposals for her Works were printed up on 1 April 1749 (Bowyer Ledger 478v; Maslen 74v).



WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON<sup>1</sup>

1 January 1749

BL: Egerton 1954.f.9

[Prior Park]

Dear Sir

M<sup>r</sup> & M<sup>rs</sup> Allen desire their respects to you. They have sent a Turkey & a Chine directed to you which they beg your acceptance of. They will be at the Carriers at Holburn bridge on Wednesday.

M<sup>r</sup> Allen has order'd me to subscribe for two sets of Montfalcon's Antiquities of France one for himself, the other for me. So pray put down the subscription to his account.<sup>2</sup>

All here join with me in our best respects to your selfe & Mr & Mrs Knapton.

and I am D<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup> your very affectionate  
friend & humble serv<sup>t</sup>

W. Warburton

Jan 1 1748/9

A happy new year to you all.

verso: To M<sup>r</sup> Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street London  
Free R: Allen

<sup>1</sup>Paul Knapton was married on 14 February 1741 (GM, xi, 108). John Knapton remained a bachelor. As Warburton sends his respects to 'your selfe & Mr & Mrs Knapton', it may be assumed he is addressing John.

<sup>2</sup>Montfaucon [sic], Monumens de la Monarchie Francoise, 5 volumes (1729-33). See Benjamin Boyce, The Benevolent Man: a life of Ralph Allen of Bath (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p. 177.

WARBURTON to KNAPTON  
BL: Egerton 1954.f.12

9 April 1749  
[Prior Park]

Dear Sir

I return the prooffe sheet corrected. You are very good in your solicitude for Mrs Cockbourn's success.<sup>1</sup> If those who most urged her to this expedient of a subscription do not slacken their zeal, it will succeed.

Any small parcels that come to you directed to me till my return I beg you will order to be sent to Mr Hitch, for Leake's parcel. All the family desire their best compliments particularly my Wife's to Mrs Knapton. Mr Allen thanks you for your last note to him concerning Dobbs book; which he perceiving is an old thing which he is already in possession of.

I beg as soon as the remaining sheets of the Dunciad are worked off they may be sent to me, in Leak's parcel.<sup>2</sup> God preserve your health till I see you again & believe me to be

Dear S<sup>r</sup> most affectionately yours

W. Warburton

Apr. 9 1749

verso: [Kn]apton [partly cut off]

<sup>1</sup>See Egerton 1954.f.8

<sup>2</sup>The Dunciad, Complete, In Four Books ... Published by Mr. Warburton, 1749 [1750]. This was 'printed for J. and P. Knapton'. [Foxon P800; Griffiths 638]

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

4 May 1749

BL: Egerton 1954.f.13

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I thank you for the favour of the preface to L[ord]. B[olingbroke]. 's tracts.<sup>1</sup>

The fact must be deemed as he relates it, because he has in his custody (by Mr Pope's own designment) all Mr Pope's papers; by which perhaps it might be contradicted, or, at least, seen in a very different light.<sup>2</sup>

However so much must be evident to every impartial Man, that Mr Pope could have no other possible end in this indiscretion (for if L.<sup>d</sup> B.'s fact be true, an indiscretion it was) than L.<sup>d</sup> B.'s honour. This appears from the nature of the work, which is calculated to do the author that sort of credit he most affects;—from Mr Pope's not destroying the impression, which he might have done with the same secrecy he had it printed, when his desperate & lingering illness gave him time to, & shew'd him the necessity of, destroying it, had he been conscious to him selfe of other [obliging?]<sup>3</sup> or lucrative views:—and lastly the idolatrous fondness he had for the

<sup>1</sup>I.e. the Advertisement to the 1749 publication of Bolingbroke's Idea of a Patriot King which attacked Pope.

<sup>2</sup>Warburton will use Bolingbroke's custodianship of Pope's private manuscripts as mitigating factor in his Letter to the Editor to be published within the month. Gentleman's Magazine (hereafter cited as GM) summarized Warburton's reply to the Advertisement in its May number.

<sup>3</sup>There is a tear in the page at this point.

Author. All this, and what ever more I think necessary in justice to my dear friend, shall certainly be laid before the Public in his life:<sup>4</sup> & let them judge between Mr Pope & this his guide, philosopher & Friend.<sup>5</sup> I for my part think him justly punished for that extravagant veneration he bore him, which led him, in support of that L<sup>d</sup>'s quarrels, to abuse many honest men, because hated by him.

He passes a most severe censure p. 94 on Dr Clark's Being & Attr. of God which I shall vindicate agt him in the 3<sup>d</sup> Vol. of the Div. Leg:

I am Dear Sir your most affectionate

Friend & humble Servant

W. Warburton

P.P. May 4 1749

<sup>4</sup>Warburton is evidently still planning to write Pope's biography. Bolingbroke writes to Mallet on 25 July 1745, 'They say that Warburton talks very indecently of your humble servant, & threatens him with the terrible things he shall throw out in a Life he is writing of our poor deceased friend Pope' (BL: Add. MSS. 35,588.f.91).

<sup>5</sup>Warburton would throw Pope's words back at Bolingbroke ironically on the title-page of his Letter to the Editor.

WARBURTON to KNAPTON

14 March [1750?]

BL: Egerton 1954.f.15

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have the favour of yours of the 7[th]  
I desire you would send Bowyer the inclosed prooffe  
sheet. I have inclosed too, a little more copy.

I shall be glad to see M<sup>r</sup> Mason's Trag:<sup>1</sup>  
If there be any thing left for me with you to make up  
a packet you may send it the usual way. I have looked  
over the 1<sup>st</sup> vol. of Popes large 8<sup>o</sup> now printing. if  
the 3<sup>d</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> vols. (in which there are the most notes)  
be printed off you may send me those three stitched for  
the same purpose

I am Dear Sir, with the  
most regard your most affect.  
friend & faithfull servt

P.P. March 14

W. Warburton

[Addendum probably in Knapton's hand:] Recd 3 MS Sheets.

Page 31. to 42 Incl and send them to Mr Bowyer Mar 16

Verso: To M<sup>r</sup> Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street London

Free R: Allen

Postmark: 16 MR

<sup>1</sup>William Mason's Elfrida was published by J. and P.  
Knapton in 1752.

WARBURTON to KNAPTON\*

15 September 1750

BL: Egerton 1954.f.16

Prior Park

[Excerpt]

[The first two paragraphs are about vague, non-literary financial matters. Warburton has cut a twenty pound note in half, mailed it, and forgotten whom he sent it to.]

[Para. 3:] I desire you would send me by the Carrier stitched the 8 v.<sup>s</sup> of Pope that are printed (the last is in the press) that I may examine the errata &c. and prepare every thing for compleating the Ed.<sup>n</sup> Pray in what forwardness are the decorations for the vols? Is the little Ed.<sup>n</sup> gone to the press? And when you think we shall be ready, & when will it be proper for publication?

[P.S.] Prior Park I am at present here alone Mr A's family & a good part of mine are now drinking the fashionable liquor, I mean seawater at Weymouth. But it is not my fortune to be in the fashion.

I am Dear Sir ever most affectionately  
yours

W. Warburton

Add: [Pocketbook notation] N.<sup>o</sup> B. 24 pay to James Colebrooke  
& C.<sup>o</sup> 50£ 26 Oct<sup>r</sup> 1749 sign Rich. Handes

N.<sup>o</sup> B. 2154 Bank post bill to M.<sup>r</sup> Bery Mendes 7 days  
sight 20£. 28 Sep.<sup>r</sup> 1748 sign. Rich. Handes.



WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

20 December 1750

BL: Egerton 1954.f.17

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I saw Mr Dingley the other day who has an influence with Major the engraver who he says is come back to England.<sup>1</sup> I desired that he would use his interest with him to engrave what you think fit to put into his hands with care & expedition; he promised he would write to him immediately, and I dare say would be glad to oblige me in this matter.

I wish the Prints wanting may be expedited all they can. I believe Bowyer has by this time finished the last Vol. that was to print. It consist of Misc. poetry & Prose.<sup>2</sup> No Prints have been thought of for this Vol. The last two tracts in it are Mr P's Prefaces to his Homer & to his Shakespear. Would not the heads of those two Poets be Proper?<sup>3</sup>

I am Dear Sir your most  
faithfull humble servt

P.P. Dec<sup>r</sup> 20 1750

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>Thomas Major (1720-1799) studied engraving in Paris under Le Bas and Cochin. After Culloden he was imprisoned in the Bastille for ten days. He completed Andrew Lawrence's 'Death of a Stag' in 1750, dedicating it to Lord Chesterfield. Major engraved the Blakey design for the frontispiece of the 1751 edition of Pope's Works, depicting Warburton as the principal figure. See Wimsatt, p. 340; and chapter IV above.

<sup>2</sup>I.e., volume VI of the 1751 Works.

<sup>3</sup>Warburton's plan was carried out in Plate XXIV of volume VI of the 1751 Works, although this frontispiece is by Francis Hayman and Charles Grignion.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

3 June 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.19

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have the favour of yours of the 1<sup>st</sup>.

We have been in great alarm here for poor Mrs Allen. We thought her dying for several days. She is yet in a very dangerous way.

I am sorry Hobracken [sic] has served you so rascally.<sup>1</sup> But there is no remedy. I have inclosed the list of presents. I have not put down Arbuthnot.<sup>2</sup> The question is whether you think proper he should have one.

I have nothing more to add at present. Nor do I know of any thing to hinder the intended publication. I hope the Letter to Bolingbroke at the end of the last Vol. is laid by carefully to be used on a proper occasion.<sup>3</sup>

I am Dear Sir most  
affectionately yours

W. Warburton

P.P. June 3<sup>d</sup> 1751

<sup>1</sup>J. Houbraken engraved the portrait of Pope which appeared at the end of the second volume of Birch's Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain published by John and Paul Knapton in 1751. This line engraving, after 'A. Pond pinxit.' (based on the Van Loo type), was done in Amsterdam in 1747. There has apparently been some set-back in transactions across the channel (Wimsatt, pp. 327-29).

<sup>2</sup>George Arbuthnot, one of Pope's executors, seems not to have been on good terms with Warburton who, in a letter to Charles Yorke (8 August [1752]), wrote, 'I should have told you that George Arbuthnot is expected here but he is an easy good natured man, of no consequence to you or me, any further than his excessive love of red mullet' (Eg.1952.f.4).

<sup>3</sup>Warburton's A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy, 1754/55.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

19 June 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.20

Prior Park

Dear Sir,

I have your favour of the 24 [14] [sic] for  
I find you begin already to write in the newstile.<sup>1</sup>

I forgot to have a Book sent in Bords to the  
Bishop of Lincoln, which I beg may be done.

If you please to send me 2 or 3 Copies by the  
Carrier.

Poor Mrs Allen continues extremely ill.<sup>2</sup>

I am Dear Sir ever most  
affectionately Yours

W. Warburton

P.P. June 19 1751

P.S.: I beg you would be so good to let Mr Hilyard  
send to Mrs Hayes as usual & pay her 10<sup>1</sup> for which  
I have sent the inclosed Bill.

<sup>1</sup>The Julian calendar officially ended in Britain  
on Wednesday 2 September 1752. The next day was Thurs-  
day 14 September - the first day of the Gregorian  
calendar - thus omitting the eleven days of 3-13 Sept-  
ember. Apart from being well over a year early, Knapton  
has been a day out: the old style 14 would have been  
the 'newstile' 25.

<sup>2</sup>Reports of Mrs Allen's illness occur in f.19 (3 June  
1751) where she is 'in a very dangerous way' and in f.22  
(3 August 1751) by which time she is 'better but extremely  
infirm'.

WARBURTON to KNAPTON

3 August 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.22

[Prior Park]

Dear Sir

I have the favour of yours of the 1<sup>st</sup> inst[ance].  
I wish you would send me a set to Correct, for I have never  
a one.<sup>1</sup>

I believe we shall find our own account in having  
the poem of the dying Christ[ian]: added to the Essay.<sup>2</sup> I  
like the project of having the pictures to the small Ed<sup>n</sup>  
extremely.<sup>3</sup>

I wonder what Bowyer means in not going forward  
with the Div[ine]. Leg[ation]:

If one had one's choice one would wish such  
execrable papers as the Magazines would meddle only with  
their own trash. But since they do what they please in  
this blessed Land of Liberty one had better see them  
impertinent rather than scurrilous.<sup>4</sup> The Public is a  
strange machine, which by fits is as early wound up by  
the veriest dunce or idiot as by the best Artist, nay  
shall be set a going so perversely, that it shall not be  
in the power of human wisdom to reform it. It is the

<sup>1</sup>I.e., the small octavo edition of Pope's Works to be  
advertised in November (London Magazine, XX, 528; pr. 27s.).

<sup>2</sup>'The dying Christian to his Soul' appears immediately  
before An Essay on Criticism in the first volume of 1751b, 82-83.

<sup>3</sup>1751b contains the same twenty-four engravings as 1751a.

<sup>4</sup>Knapton has presumably forwarded unfavourable reviews of  
1751a; by 9 December 1751 (Eg. 1954.f.34) Warburton will have  
seen John Gilbert Cooper's attack, Cursory Remarks.

condition of human things that the most insignificant of all animals shall do most unaccountable mischief. The states of holland had like to have been ruined by a simple water-rat. In such a case an Author has consolation enough because he knows justice will be done him by Posterity, In the mean time a Bookseller has none who may have contributed as much or more than the Author to oblige the Public.

Mrs Allen is better but extremely infirm and we are all obliged to you for your kind inquiries.

I am Dear Sir  
your most affectionate  
friend & faithfull servant  
W. Warburton

Aug<sup>t</sup> 3 1751

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

13 August 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.23

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have yours of the 10<sup>th</sup> I forgot in my last to reply to what you inquired ab[ou]t in your last but one concerning two of the imitations of the Satires of Horace q<sup>o</sup> with my notes that came to you in the parcel of the two sets. I hardly know what was meant by those qo<sup>s</sup> but as my man packed up the books I suppose he put in those as wast[e] paper so desire they may be burnt.<sup>1</sup>

Jortin gave me on several detached pieces of paper a list of errata when he read over the vols.<sup>2</sup> These I gave to Bowyer to extract out of them what was material to print in the list of errata. But for his own acct he was too sparing. I desire you would ask him for those papers & indorse them to me, that I may correct the remainder.

Dear Sir ever most affectionately

P.P. Aug<sup>t</sup> 13 1751

yours

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>Warburton is apparently referring to some 'quarto' sheets which have been used in packing books. As the paper has been written on by Warburton, Knapton has asked whether it is of importance. Warburton assumes it is scrap and bids it be destroyed. He uses 'q<sup>o</sup>' in Egerton 1954.f.58 for 'quarto'.

<sup>2</sup>Warburton's then friend John Jortin, D.D. (1698-1770), proofread the large octavo edition of Pope's Works. He had attended Jesus College, Cambridge. 'While an undergraduate he was selected by his tutor, Styan Thirlby, to translate some passages from Eustathius for the notes to Pope's "Homer," and noticed an error in Pope's translation, which Pope silently corrected in a later edition' (DNB, X, 1089).



WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

24 August 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.25

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have sent the set of Popes back again corrected.

only at p. 231 V. 3 in the notes col. 2<sup>d</sup> at the bottom abt the court of Chancery, strike out the correction & let it be as first printed.<sup>1</sup>

Mrs Allen still continues extreme infirm. Mr A. has carried her & the family to Weymouth. As they stay there some time I thought proper to retard my going, having time enough to follow them if I take a fancy to it. In the mean time when you have occasion to write let it be under cover To M<sup>r</sup> Prinn [sic]<sup>2</sup> at Ralph Allen's Esq. or otherwise it will go round about by Weymouth.

Dear Sir ever most affectionately Yours

P.P. Aug<sup>t</sup> 24 1751

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>Works, III, 230-31. The note to line 105 of Moral Essay III, 'To Bathurst', concerns Sir Robert Sutton's appeal in the Court of Chancery. Warburton has rechanged his mind about amending this vindication of his former patron.

Warburton's direction draws our attention to one change in format between the 1751 and 1752 large octavo editions: in the fourth volume his notes were given in one column, while in the third volume they occupied two columns in the 1751 Works; the 1752 Works has single-column notes throughout.

<sup>2</sup>Samuel Prynne was Ralph Allen's clerk (Boyce, The Benevolent Man, p. 156). He was also named in Allen's will.

WARBURTON to [JOHN KNAPTON]

31 August 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.26

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have the favour of yours with the Advertisement inclosed.<sup>1</sup> I think you do extremely right. But it is enough at any time that I know your opinion in these matters to approve it.

If your second Vol of the illustrious Heads be published you may send it hither by the Carrier bound as soon as you can, for M<sup>r</sup> Allen.<sup>2</sup>

M<sup>r</sup> P. Knapton promised me I should have the little prints before your transl[ation]. of Rollins Anc[ient]. Hist[ory]. for my little french Ed.<sup>n</sup>

Should not I have a sight of the small Ed.<sup>n</sup> of Pope to see there be no notorious blunders committed for I have never yet seen one sheet of it.<sup>3</sup> At least somebody should look it over.

Pray when you see Dodsley ask him when it is that he shall want the Dissertation of the 6<sup>th</sup> B[ook]. of Virgil which I have promised to prepare for him, and if he will let me know I will send it to him at the time.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Warburton complains about the Advertisement in f.31 below.

<sup>2</sup>I.e., Birch's Heads of Illustrious Persons, volume II.

<sup>3</sup>The small octavo Works will not be advertised until November in the Gentleman's Magazine.

<sup>4</sup>Warburton's 'Dissertation on the Sixth Book of the Aeneid' was published in Robert Dodsley's Latin-English edition of Virgil's Works on 25 January 1753 (Ralph Straus, Robert Dodsley: Poet, Publisher & Playwright, p. 346).

I see by Jortin's list that Bowyer had taken in the most considerable part of the errata.<sup>5</sup> I wonder whether in the little Ed.<sup>n</sup> the errata are corrected.—You see in the corrected copy of the large which I sent you back I have made few or no additions or alterations. what I have corrected relates only to the improvement of the stile, or turn of the period, in which I always endeavour to be very exact. and one always finds something or other of this kind to render more perfect.

Dear Sir ever most affectionately yours

P.P. Aug<sup>t</sup> 31 1751

W. Warburton

<sup>5</sup>For Jortin's involvement as a proofreader of the 1751 large octavo Works, see ff. 23 and 29.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

Fryday morning

BL: Egerton 1954.f.28

[September 1751?]

Dear Sir

I dined with M<sup>r</sup> Y[orke]. yesterday & he told me that he had the following case laid before him to this effect, not long since,<sup>1</sup>

"That considering the great discouragement of learning by monopolizing the property of Books A. desired to know whether he & B. & C. &c could safely print some old Books such as Milton & others when the 2 fourteen years were expired."<sup>2</sup>

He said the case put him in mind of such another, formerly laid before S<sup>r</sup> W. Jones; by which he understood that A., under many plausible pretences, had a mind to defraud his Creditors; to which he gave the following Opinion, "If A has a great desire to outwit his Creditors he has nothing to do to hand himselfe, and, in that case, his goods & chattles [sic] will be forfeit to the King." The opinion of M<sup>r</sup> Y. gave to these Pirats [sic] was, "that they would run themselves into great dangers, & advised them to think of no such thing." And when the Sol[icito]<sup>r</sup> came for the case he said this to him, S<sup>r</sup>. I know your Clients would be at, and what has encouraged them to think of this

<sup>1</sup>Presumably Charles Yorke (1722-1770) the Lord Chancellor with whom Warburton conducted a long correspondence.

<sup>2</sup>Referring to the Act for the Encouragement of Learning, 1709/10.

piece of Knavery, it was something that dropt from the Chancellor, tho' he delivered the opinion, in the Scotch cause.<sup>3</sup> But assure them from me that however that cause turns out, they will get nothing by it, for property will be secured by Parliament if it be wanting, and I know many Gentlemen in the house of Commons who will concur to [secure?] it. I thought proper to let you know this

And am Dear Sir most affectionately

Yours

Fryday morning

W. Warburton

<sup>3</sup>In the first test-case over copyright in Scotland, Andrew Millar accused twenty-nine Scottish publishers, including Gavin Hamilton and Allan Ramsay, of pirating Thomson's Seasons, the rights to which he owned. Millar eventually was forced to drop the charge at the Court of Session in Edinburgh in 1739, although he brought another action against twenty booksellers in Edinburgh and four in Glasgow between 1743-49. The court eventually decided that perpetual copyright was not lawful. See Warren McDougall, 'Gavin Hamilton, Bookseller in Edinburgh', British Journal for Eighteenth-century Studies, vol. I, no. I (Spring 1978), pp. 1-19.

WARBURTON to KNAPTON\*

9 September 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.29

Prior Park

[Evans, 141-42]

Dear Sir

I have the favour of yours of the 7<sup>th</sup>.

I think if Mr Birche or Mr Jortin which you will would just look over the small Ed.<sup>n</sup> it would be perfectly right.

[Complaint about a 'Rogue', Thomas Osborne, over piracy.]

I think this is all very well for the present exigency. But while the trade only uses this temporary expedience to stop the mischief from time to time, it will be always breaking out, till at last it will end in a settled confusion and destruction of property. Whereas a quarter of that money well employed to sollicite justice either of the Judges, or Legislature, would put an effectual end to the mischief, either by a sentence of the acknowledged property, or by procuring a new Law.

As for the property I have, if the established Courts of Justice will not secure me in it, I would give my selfe no concern about it, it is the most indifferent thing to me. But you know, I hope, my friendship for you would engage me to serve you every way in my power, for the security of your great property.



But let me tell you that you & your brother are the only persons in the trade for whom I have the least regard in this matter. I have been used in various ways so indifferently by most of the rest, (tho' I think I deserved better of the trade in general, who, by their conduct shew, that no gratitude, no obligation, no duty divine or human can bind them where the question is abt getting a penny) I say that was it not on acct of a man of so much worth as your selfe, & whom I so sincerely love, I could, with satisfaction enough, see literary property turned upon the common, to teach those men the baseness of their actions.

You know that my fixed opinion is that the true remedy for any temporary invasion of property is the Court of Chancery. And the only effectual [remedy] is an application to Parliament. You know my mind at large and my scheme on this subject. I have repeated it often to you. And I shall say no more. Only be assured of this I am always at your service and in your own way. For a man that will serve his friend, not in his friend's, but his own way, serves him only by halves.

I am Dear S<sup>r</sup> ever most affectionately  
yours  
W. Warburton

JOHN KNAPTON to THOMAS BIRCH

1 October 1751

BL: Add. MSS. 4312.f.41

Tuesday Oct. 1<sup>st</sup> 1751Rev<sup>d</sup> Sir

I send by the bearer the two Editions of  
Mr Pope's Works.<sup>1</sup>

The inclosed is a Copy of some Errata Mr  
W[arburton]. has sent me in y<sup>e</sup> Notes—————  
I am S<sup>r</sup>

y<sup>r</sup> most humble Serv<sup>t</sup>,

John Knapton

verso: To the Revd Mr Birch in Norfolk Street

<sup>1</sup>Apart from himself, Warburton has had two proofreaders,  
Birch and John Jortin.

WARBURTON to KNAPTON

14 October 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.31

Prior Park

Dear Sir

The printer, whoever he be, has had no kind regard to my directions abt printing the Advertisement For in the begining [sic] after the word Advertisement I directed it should be said

to the 8<sup>o</sup> Ed<sup>n</sup>

or something to that purpose. And towards the end tho' I made the alteration which he has printed yet in my last letter to you I told you I had altered my mind & would have it printed verbatim in that place (as well as in all others) according to y<sup>r</sup> 8<sup>o</sup> Ed.<sup>1</sup>

D<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup> ever most affectionately yours

Monday Oct<sup>r</sup> 14 1751

W. Warburton

P.S.: I propose being in Town the latter end of next week—

Verso: To Mr Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street London

Free R: Allen

Postmark: 16 OC

<sup>1</sup>Warburton mentions the Advertisement in f.26 (31 August 1751) and is angry that Bowyer or one of his compositors has not carried out his instructions to the letter. The small octavo edition of 1751 accordingly carried the phrase, 'to the Octavo Edition'. A note at the end of Warburton's Advertisement in the small octavo reads, 'N.B. This Edition of Mr. Pope's Works is printed verbatim from the large Octavo; with all his Notes, and a select number of the Editor's' (xi). Warburton's Advertisement, which gives a volume-by-volume lay-out of the nine-volume edition (e.g. referring to volumes VII-IX containing the letters), is reprinted without modification in the ten-volume edition of 1754 and the six-volume edition of 1770. This confusion may have been a result of Warburton's strict instructions and his unwillingness to revise the Advertisement.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

19 October 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.32

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I would have the inclosed leaf reprinted and likewise that which I sent you some time ago, which was the first leaf of the Im[itation] of Hor[ace]. addressed to Mr Murray.<sup>1</sup> and I am very indifferent whether you reprint any more.

Andr[ew]. Millar came up here yesterday to pay me a visit. We talked of matters of his profession. He said several absurd things which it is not worth while to trouble you with.

I am D<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup> ever most affectionatelyP.P. Oct.<sup>r</sup> 19 1751

Yours W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>Warburton has evidently made a few corrections in Epistle I vi for the small octavo edition (vol. IV).

<sup>2</sup>Andrew Millar has possibly made some suggestions as to how he might better publish Pope's Works. Warburton has little to do with him at the moment, as Millar is planning to publish Bolingbroke's Works, but he will become the main proprietor of Pope's Works after the set-back in the Knaptons' business in 1755. See Egerton 1959.ff.16v, 15, 16r (1-3 January 1754); and 1954.f.73 below.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

1 December 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.33

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I got well home last night tolerably fatigued. The weather was cold, the roads were dirty, and the post-chaise was not hung in air. So that by the time I got hither I was fully satisfied with this amusing exercise. You will not forget your inquiries after what I find will be difficult to get, [Narber?] or part-[mahone?] Honey.

I beg that three of the 6 sets of Pope may be sent hither & the other three sent to my maid in Bedford Row.<sup>1</sup>

I am with the honest esteem Dear Sir  
your most affectionate &  
faithfull humble servt

W. Warburton

P.P. Dec<sup>r</sup> 1 1751

<sup>1</sup>Presumably gift sets of the small octavo edition.

WARBURTON to KNAPTON\*

9 December 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.34

[Extract]

Prior Park

[Warburton has received Knapton's letter of the sixth. He expects to return to London towards the end of January and is awaiting a parcel from Knapton.]

[Para. 2:] You need not have given your selfe the trouble to send the Pamphlet of Cooper,<sup>1</sup> for I have never read any of the trash wrote ag<sup>t</sup> me of several years, any more than I do of anonymous Letters, a method I learnt of the Bp of London who thinks it an exquisite disappointment, and, (when they know it) a mortal disappointment to Libellers.

[Warburton plans to publish sixteen or seventeen sermons under the title, The Principles of Religion natural & revealed, in 'as small an impression as can possibly be printed'; he also wants it 'extremely well printed', and it should be ready for the press next winter.]

[Last para.:] Another thing I must not forget to mention with regard to the remainder of the impression of the 2<sup>d</sup> Vol. of the Div. Leg. I think to destroy it, paying you back the 25<sup>l</sup> which I desire to set down to my account & make me a debtor for. Because I have much improved the 2<sup>d</sup> Vol. like the first. and I would have the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>d</sup> of a piece, & fit to be joined to the last.

P.P. Dec<sup>r</sup> 9 1751

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>John Gilbert Cooper; see chapter III above.



WARBURTON to KNAPTON

[n.d.]

Egerton 1954.f.36

Dear Sir<sup>1</sup>

I am by no means satisfied with paying more for the present books of pope's [sic] works, than paper & print; besides binding. The difference between that & the common price is very considerable, in a quantity that comes according to Mr K[napton]'s acct, to abt 120<sup>l</sup> and tho' I receive part of the price (above paper & print) back, yet it is above a half part: therefore I think my selfe very hardly used, as being contrary to the general custom. Nor could the other proprietors grudge it as I make their property so much better by inserting it into a compleat Ed<sup>n</sup> of the works.

[no signature]

verso: To Mr Knapton

<sup>1</sup>The opening salutation has been taken from a different letter.

WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON\*

22 December 1751

BL: Egerton 1954.f.37

Prior Park

[Excerpt]

[Warburton acknowledges Knapton's letter of the 19th. He refers to 'the affair of the honey' (mentioned in f.33). Warburton is preparing an edition of sermons and will send 'copy' shortly; he is also sponsoring the payment of ten pounds of Mr Hilliard of York to Mrs Hayes. The letter ends with a seasonal cheer to 'you & Mr & Mrs Knapton'.]

[In a P.S. Warburton writes: 'I hear Ld Bol. is dead I believe I have lost an Enemy in his death but I am sure our Country has lost a greater.']\*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bolingbroke died on 12 December 1751 at the age of seventy-three. His will, made on 22 November (which named Mallet as his literary executor), was proved on 5 March 1752. It was published by James Crokatt in the same year. He died a bitter man, feeling betrayed 'by the Injustice and Treachery of Persons nearest to me; by the Negligence of Friends; and by the Infidelity of Servants'. His fortune was less than £1000 [BL: Official Publications Library: 357.D.9-12].

WARBURTON to [WILLIAM HOGARTH]

28 March 1752

BL: Add. MSS. 27,995.f.7

Prior Park

Dear Sir,

I was pleased to find by the public papers, that you have determined to give us your original & Masterly thoughts on the great principles of your Profession.

You ow[e] this to your Country; for you are both an Honour to your Profession, and a Shame to that worthless crew professing Vertu [sic] & connoisseurship; to whom, all that grovel in the splendid poverty of wealth & taste are the miserable bubbles.

I beg you would give me leave to contribute my mite towards this work, & permit the inclosed to intitle me to a subscription for two copies.<sup>1</sup>

I am Dear Sir, (with a true sense of your superior talents) your

very affectionate humble serv.<sup>t</sup>

P.P. March 28 1752

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>Four days before this letter was written, Hogarth's intention of writing his Analysis of Beauty was announced. Subscribers had to wait until the end of 1753 before receiving their copies. The other copy is presumably for Ralph Allen. See Derek Jarrett, The Ingenious Mr Hogarth (London, 1976), p. 154-55. Also in Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, V, 604, with slight alterations (e.g. the date reads 1753).

WARBURTON to KNAPTON

17 June 1752

BL: Egerton 1954.f.30

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I got home yesterday in the afternoon, and found the poor Bp of Durham had been dead three or four hours.<sup>1</sup>

I have inclosed five half bills for 100<sup>l</sup> & when I know these have come safe I will send the other halves to desire you after midsummer to buy me another 100<sup>l</sup> stock in the same annuity.

I am Dear Sir your most  
affectionate friend &  
faithfull servt

W. Warburton

Prior Park June 17 1752

<sup>1</sup>Dr Joseph Butler. See also Warburton's letter to Thomas Balguy on 21 June 1752 (Nichols, Illustrations, vol. II (1817), 170 and n.).

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]\*[before 22 July 1752]<sup>1</sup>

BL: Egerton 1954.f.40

Prior Park

[Warburton asks Knapton to send a package of books to Mr Schmidt in Germany which is to contain three volumes of the Divine Legation (which his maid will forward from Bedford Row), Alliance between Church and State, Julian, and Miscellaneous Remarks. There is no mention of Pope.]

---

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

22 July 1752

BL: Egerton 1954.f.41

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have heard nothing yet of the set of the new Ed. of Pope which were to be sent to me to look over. I desire there may be sent with them Bp Butler's last Ed.<sup>n</sup> of his Sermons.

Pray could you continue to get the books sent into Germany.

I am

Dear Sir ever most affectionately yours

P.P. July 22 1752

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>The next letter (22 July 1752) helps to date this one in which Warburton asks Knapton to send some of his books to Germany.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

3 August 1752

BL: Egerton 1954.f.45

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I thank you for the favour of your last  
& am much obliged for the contents.

I agree with you that it is better to deferr  
the publication of the new 8<sup>o</sup> till more company comes  
to Towne.<sup>1</sup>

I think it is right to put the small 8<sup>o</sup> to  
the press, to be printed verbatim from the new 8<sup>o</sup> with  
all the Commentaries &c forthwith.<sup>2</sup>

A great woman, now coming to Bath, & hearing  
that Mr Allen is going to Weymouth, has, in her princely  
fancy taken a likeing to his house, & desired the use of  
it for 3 weeks or a month.<sup>3</sup> This force[s] me to go to  
Weymouth with the family m[uch] agt my will. One would  
imagine one was free from the mischiefs of courts, when  
one never goes there.—She comes for a deafness, which  
the people of Surry pretended to find out and was willing  
to cure. But I suspect theirs to be a quack-medicine be-  
cause I saw it advertised in a very scoundrel newspaper.

I am Dear Sir Your most affectionate  
friend & faithfull Servant

P.[P.] Aug<sup>t</sup> 3 1752

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>Presumably the 1752 Works.

<sup>2</sup>The 1753 Works.

<sup>3</sup>The 'great woman' is Princess Amelia. See Letters from a late Eminent Prelate, edited by R. Hurd, p. 90 (17 August 1752).



WARBURTON to KNAPTON\*

15 October 1752

BL: Egerton 1954.f.52

Prior Park

[Warburton has been ill, but is slowly recovering.]

[Para. 2:] I have not had time any more than to  
cast my eye over the Ed.<sup>n</sup>

in Vol. 5 p. 76 1 line of Var. for lines

rea[d] Editions

p. 167 rem[ark]. on v. 355 l. 5 for

of factions read

or factions

in V. 4 p. 33 Var. l. 9 for thine read

mine

I dare say there are many more if looked into.<sup>1</sup> I  
leave it to you whether this can be done, & whether  
each printed should not be required to look over  
what he printed for this purpose. I have only ordered  
one leaf to be reprinted which is in the inclosed to  
Bowyer. so you may publish it as soon as you please.

[Warburton wants remaining copies of the second  
volume of The Divine Legation burnt; Knapton has evi-  
dently bought up Mahood's [?] stock. Newton's edition  
of Paradise Regain'd (1752), printed for J. and R. Tonson,  
is due any day, and Warburton anticipates a complimentary  
copy for his assistance to be delivered at Ludgate Street.  
A reference is made to William Mason's account.]

---

<sup>1</sup>These errors occur in the 1752 Works. Warburton is  
right: one glaring typo appears in volume IV, 297, where a  
half-title reads: 'EPILOGUE TO THE SATITES'.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

26 October 1752

BL: Egerton 1954.f.53

Prior Park

Dear Sir

You are very good in what you say with relation to my friends. In matters that are fit to be done between one man of honour & another in their intercourse of this nature, one cannot prescribe to them in such a manner as perhaps one would think fit to act ones selfe. I did let M<sup>r</sup> M[illar?]<sup>1</sup> understand that in my opinion one full 3<sup>d</sup> p<sup>t</sup> of the clear profits was the last that could probably be offered. You may easily imagine the impact of his letter necessarily led me to go thus low with him. But as he is a very ingenious as well as a very worthy man I hope matters will be settled to your mutual satisfaction.

I have returned the two leaves corrected I have inclosed another to be reprinted, and this is all the trouble I shall give you for this Ed.<sup>n2</sup>

Dear Sir most faithfully

&amp; entirely yours

P.P. Oct<sup>r</sup> 26 1752

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>Warburton refers to William Mason's account in the previous letter (f.52; 15 October 1752), although it would seem more likely that the 'very ingenious as well as a very worthy man' at this point is Andrew Millar.

<sup>2</sup>Possibly the 1752 large octavo edition of Pope's Works, in which case his corrected leaves may be too late.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]\*

19 December 1752

BL: Egerton 1954.f.56

Prior Park

[Someone returning from London has brought to Warburton's attention that copies of the second volume of Divine Legation which he had ordered destroyed over a year ago (see Eg. 1954.f.34; 9 Dec. 1751) are still available.<sup>1</sup> He jokingly suggests that he should have added some potentially seditious remarks to expedite burning.]

<sup>1</sup>See also Egerton 1954.ff.6-7 ([1748?]; above) in which Warburton asks that copies of the second volume of Divine Legation be 'rendered imperfect'; also Egerton 1954.f.52 (15 October 1752).

WARBURTON to KNAPTON  
BL: Egerton 1954.f.58

25 April 1753  
Prior Park

Dear Sir

I got home well, & two or three days after, rec'd the 8<sup>o</sup> copy of Pope for the small ed.<sup>n</sup> I have struck out most of the notes & corrected it for that purpose, And have ordered it to be sent back to you by the same conveyance. Concerning which I have only two or three words to add. I beg you would give particular charge for the correct printing. and that the compositors & correctors when they see any manifest erratum in their copy, that they would not let it go on forever but correct it on the spot.

My other proposal is That what notes are left be not printed, as in all the other Ed.<sup>ns</sup>, under each page: but all together at the end of each poem, to which they belong; and the notes of the Dunciad at the end of each Book, as in Mr Pope's q[uart]<sup>o</sup> ed.<sup>ns</sup> both of his Poems & Homer. My reasons are these, first it will be a variety from the other Ed.<sup>ns</sup> but principally I think the small chara[c]ter of the notes in the specimen you have, deforms & hurts the beauty of the Ed.<sup>n</sup>

It appears to be much more elegant to have nothing but verses in the page or nothing but prose. besides if the notes be thrown together as I propose they will be in the same letter with the text, which will make the Ed.<sup>n</sup> more beautifull, & what is still of

more consequence will swell it out a little more,  
which it will want to be. Again, could I, without  
trouble, [have?] a dozen copies printed on a large  
paper for presents? I think to go to Gloucester in  
a few days from whence you s[hall] [h]ear from me.  
But all letters coming here get to me wherever I am.

Dear Sir ever most affectionately

Yours W. Warburton

P.P. Apr. 25 1753

verso: To M<sup>r</sup> Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street London  
Free R: Allen.

---

WARBURTON to PAUL KNAPTON\*

30 May 1753

BL: Egerton 1954.f.60

Prior Park

[Warburton's servant at his Bedford Row residence has recently married. He writes to Paul Knapton to ask if his wife knows of any available help. In a postscript he says, 'Pray tell Mr. J. Knapton I recd his favour at Gloucester & was in hopes of receiving a specimen of the little Ed<sup>n</sup> of Pope [six?] now.' This is the nine-volume crown octavo edition of 1753 which Warburton, writing to Hurd a month later, described as 'the correctest of all' (Letters from a Late Eminent Prelate, ed. Hurd, p. 104).]

[Overleaf: Warburton's Sun Fire policy paid by Knapton.]



WARBURTON to KNAPTON\*

9 June 1753

BL: Egerton 1954.f.62

Prior Park

[Warburton thanks Mrs Knapton (hence this letter may be addressed to Paul Knapton). He acknowledges a letter of 5 June.]

[Para. 2:] I am pretty much in the same sentiments as to the notes at the end. But I entirely submit it to your better judgment. I thought two advantages were obvious, the beauty of the Edition, and the thickening it out, which we thought it would want.

[Warburton has found a prebendal house, or rather two: 'one is supposed to be resided in, the other let'. He wants them both insured 'in the sun-fire office at 800<sup>l</sup> that is 400<sup>l</sup> each'. The residence is in College-green, Gloucestershire. Warburton wants Knapton to see to the insurance immediately. He will be travelling to London shortly.]<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Warburton probably took out a Sun Fire Insurance policy on the advice of Ralph Allen who was one of that company's shareholders. See P.G.M. Dickson, The Sun Insurance Office 1710-1960 (London, 1960), p. 291.

I am grateful to D.L. Hill of the Sun Alliance Insurance Group for providing me with a photocopy of the entry of Warburton's policy (no. 136119) which was paid for by Knapton one week after this letter was posted.

The entry (opposite) shows that Knapton paid £1 4s. on Warburton's behalf for a year's protection against fire to the maximum of £800. Warburton would have been sent a sun-shaped fire-mark to affix to his adjoining prebendal houses.

JOHN and PAUL KNAPTON to WARBURTON

10 July 1753

BL: Egerton 1954.f.63 (receipt)

[London]

July. 10. 1753. Rec<sup>d</sup> of the Revd Mr Warburton a Bill  
drawn by The Price on Mr John Gorham to John King on  
order for one hundred and seven pounds, payable the  
5<sup>th</sup> of Aug<sup>t</sup> for which I promise to be accountable

107:0:0

John &amp; Paul Knapton

verso: 1753 Aug<sup>t</sup> 7. Lent to Mr Warburton 2 Bank Notes

for—————20£ each—————£40

Aug<sup>t</sup> 10—————2 D<sup>o</sup>—————40

80

Remain due to Mr W. Aug<sup>t</sup> 1427

107

WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON\*

17 July 1753

BL: Egerton 1954.f.64

[Prior Park]

[On second thought Warburton decides he cannot spare  
the above-mentioned £107 for investment, so he would  
like it back, 'but only half at a time, that is the  
bills cut in two'. In the second paragraph he writes,  
'I hear nothing yet from Bowyer of any proofs.']

WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON\*

28 July 1753

BL: Egerton 1954.f.65

Prior Park

[Warburton writes that he arrived at Prior Park last night and has received Knapton's two letters. He sends something, presumably proof sheets, 'inclosed for Bowyer'.]  
verso: John Knapton, Bookseller

---

WARBURTON to KNAPTON\*

9 August 1753

BL: Egerton 1954.f.66

Prior Park

[Warburton acknowledges receiving two halves of a twenty pound note. He would like to order a copy of William Camden's Britannia if the maps are good. Ralph Allen wants to buy the Dictionary of Commerce in boards.]

---

WARBURTON to KNAPTON\*

17 October 1753

BL: Egerton 1954.f.70

Prior Park

[Warburton hopes that Bowyer has finished the first two parts of the Divine Legation: 'His Compositor made sad blunders in paging two sheets, so He wrote me word he would reprint them at his own expence. I mention this that you may keep him to his word.']

---

[WARBURTON to ANDREW MILLAR] [late December 1753]

BL: Egerton 1959.f.16.v (transcript)<sup>1</sup>

Answ<sup>r</sup> to M<sup>r</sup> M[illar]. 's first Letter

————As to what you say concerning the publication of B[olingbroke]'s works my answer is this, That, in a plain question of right & wrong, an honest man has nothing to do but consult his own breast. It appears to me that he who for gain contributes, in any way, to the spreading of a work which, in his own conscience, he believes injurious to society, is just as honest a man as he who for a reward undertakes to scatter poison into all the Wells & Cisterns of his Neighbourhood.

<sup>1</sup>This would appear to be a rough draught of a reply to a letter from Millar who is attempting to placate Warburton about the forthcoming publication of Bolingbroke's Works. Millar's reply to the final copy of the above letter follows (1 January 1753/4); Warburton's answer (3 January 1754) is slightly less adamantly opposed to the forthcoming publication.

ANDREW MILLAR to [WARBURTON]

1 January 1754

BL: Egerton 1959.f.15

London

1 Jan. 1753[4] Lond.

Rev.<sup>nd</sup> Sir

I rec<sup>d</sup> the fav<sup>r</sup> of your's [sic], and thank you for it. You observe very justly, that it is a Plain Question of right and wrong,<sup>1</sup> an honest man need only consult his own breast, and express yourself very strongly w[ith]<sup>h</sup> regard to one's contributing in any degree towards spreading pernicious [injurious?] opinions. So far as this relates to L<sup>d</sup> B—s works I cannot help thinking that whatever his L<sup>d</sup> advances against Christianity will be so far from being of any prejudice to its Interests, that I am fully convinced it will be of advantage to them on the whole, by engaging persons of real abilities and just discernment to place the Evidences of our Religion in a stronger & clearer light. I need not tell you Sir that the Evidence of Xianity has never been so well understood as since <sup>Deists [?]</sup> Dicoets[?] have written w[ith]<sup>h</sup> such freedom ag<sup>t</sup> it — as to my Putting my name to them, I have consulted Two D<sup>rs</sup> of Divinity of the Church of England, a Bishop, some of the most eminent of the Dissenting Ministry & Several Lay People of Candor & reputation distinguished in the World and not unknown to you, who are all upon this Point clear and advise me to it, as Mallet puts his name as Published by him and Printed for the

<sup>1</sup>This is a reply to Egerton 1959.f.16.v (n.d.). Millar repeats Warburton's phrases, 'a plain question of right & wrong' and 'consult his own breast'.

Editor—and my name is only one amongst others of my Trade.<sup>2</sup>

There is scarce any however on whom Judgment in any Matter of Difficult determination, I would sooner rely on than on yours or to whom I would be more desirous of approving myself, and I am persuaded when you have duly considered the Matter you will not think I have counteracted the Dictates of a good heart by doing a Thing of this nature, or That Christianity can suffer any thing essential to its best Interest by any thing L<sup>d</sup> B— is capable of advancing. I am Rev<sup>nd</sup> Sir Y<sup>r</sup>  
Most obliged & Obed<sup>t</sup> Ser<sup>t</sup>

And. Millar

verso: Millar's Letter abt Bolingbr[o]ke]

<sup>2</sup> Millar's name headed the list on the 1754 imprint of the first volume of Bolingbroke's Works: 'London: Printed for the Editor; and sold by A. Millar, in the Strand; G. Hawkins, near Temple-bar; R. Dodsley, in Pall Mall; and S. Bladon, in Pater-noster-row. MDCCLIV.' Whatever disdain Warburton may have felt over the publication of Bolingbroke's Works, Millar's name would appear on the imprint of Pope's Works in 1756.



WARBURTON to ANDREW MILLAR  
Egerton 1959.f.16r (transcript)

3 January 1754  
Prior Park

P.P. Jan. 3 1754

Answer to M<sup>r</sup> M[illar]. 's 2<sup>d</sup> letter

Sir

I never thought my opinion of much weight where better judges were of a different ; on the other hand, I would not see an honest man deceive himself, If I could set him right.

I believe with you, that these execrable writings<sup>1</sup> will be the occasion of putting Truth in a more irresistible light. I believe too, that providence produces a deal of good out of every species of natural and moral evil. But this, I think, will not justify any one in deliberately contributing to the propagation of that Evil. And whatever benefit to Religion may arise from the learned confutation of B[olingbroke']s impieties, it will be but a poor reparation [sic] for the vast mischief they will do amongst the weak heads and bad hearts of a People

Few wou'd receive more contentment in Seeing, or more pleasure in answering these writings than my self. Yet God forbid, I should ever preferr my private Satisfaction to the peace and happiness of Society.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bolingbroke's Works. Warburton already has a counter-attack prepared in the form of a critique which he decided to suppress in 1751 (see Egerton 1954.f.19 and f.89).

At the same time I make no question but you Satisfy your own judgment when you act on different Sentiments: and then nobody has any reason to be dissatisfied [sic] with you: at least, not I, to whom you pay a compliment,<sup>2</sup> which I had no pretensions to expect, when you are pleas'd to account to me for your conduct.

I am &c

[no signature]

<sup>2</sup>Referring to Millar's letter of 1 January 1754 (Egerton 1959.f.15) above.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]\*

7 January 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.73

[Para. 2 begins:] The other papers which I inclose are just for your brother and you to laugh over in great secret. Millar has determined after all to be concerned in the publication of Bol[ingbroke']<sup>s</sup> Works and had a mind to make a dupe of me to approve his conduct. On which acc<sup>t</sup> writing to me to borrow a book which he could not get elsewhere. He told me as a piece of news that B.'s works would be publ[ished] in Feb. and as Mallet put his name to them, so some of my friends thought he need have no scruple to put his [name] This occasion'd the answer to his first letter.<sup>1</sup> He replied which reply I have sent with a copy of my answer to that, as well as to the first.—You will smile; & your brother will call him a R——l. I know what I think him. However I should not have given my selfe the trouble but that I was resolved he should have no pretence of putting me amongst his approbation-Doctors. But all this inter nos Dear Sir my compliments of the season to all the family. believe me ever most affectionately yours

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup> Millar's first letter referred to here does not appear in the Egerton collection, although Warburton's reply to it survives in a transcript (Eg. 1959.f.16v; n.d.) The 'Rascal's' second letter concerning his decision to go on with the publication of Bolingbroke's Works is found in Eg. 1959.f.15 (1 January 1754), as is Warburton's second answer (Eg. 1959.f.16r).

WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON

28 January 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.75

[Prior Park]

Dear Sir

The inclosed speak [for] themselves.<sup>1</sup> If you think my Answer fit to be sent I wish a copy may be taken of it. For the man's an entire stranger to me.

I have looked into Bolingbroke. If one of the damned was to be made, in a poetical description, exclaiming against Moses & Paul he could not do it with more rage and blasphemous language than is done by this noble Lord. And this, that good A Millar helps forward into the world for the pure sake of Religion & the public good.

I am Dear Sir entirely

yours

Jan. 28 1754

W. Warburton

verso: To M<sup>r</sup> John Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street

Free R: Allen

<sup>1</sup>Referring to Egerton 1954.ff.76-77; f.78 (26/28 January 1754) following. Proposals for printing by subscription John Sayer's Latin translation of the Essay on Man from the Warburton edition (presumably one of the small octavos) were issued in Oxford on 19 November 1750 (Harry Carter, A History of the Oxford University Press (OUP, 1975), I, 539). A notice appeared in London Magazine, XXI (March-April 1752), p. 195, for: 'Mr. Pope's third Essay on Man: Translated into Latin Verse. By J. Sayer, M.A. pr. 2s. 6d. Rivingtons.' Hence the above and the following correspondence. This is discussed in my last chapter in the section on copyright problems.

## FOUR LETTERS BETWEEN Warburton and John Sayer\*

BL: Egerton 1954.ff.76-77;      26 January-22 February 1754  
f.78; f.79; f. 85

[Sayer wants to publish his Latin translation of the Essay on Man and has paid a visit to Knapton. Sayer has evidently published (or is about to publish) his translation, along with Pope's text, of the third epistle. In his first letter to Warburton (26 January 1754; f.76), Sayer confesses his 'Unacquaintance with the Nature of Literary Property', but thinks his project will not 'prejudice' Warburton's edition of the Essay in terms of sales. Sayer proposes a subscription.

Warburton's reply (28 January 1754; f.78) from Prior Park is somewhat heavy-handed: 'Soon after Mr Pope died I was necessitated to put half a dozen people, who pirated the Essay on man, into Chancery.<sup>1</sup> Since which I have been but little injured in my property of it.' He advises Sayer to go back to Knapton for permission.

Warburton's next letter (7 February 1754; f.79) is again unhelpful. Sayer's zeal has apparently overridden his discretion. 'As you seem to make too slight of property so you infinitely overrate my power observing you in the subscription. I indeed have none at all'. However, Warburton, although he has never met Sayer, is willing to subscribe to his proposed edition. On 22 February 1754 (f.85) Sayer asks permission to print 500 copies.]

---

<sup>1</sup>I have asked R.J. Goulden (see his list, Some Chancery Lawsuits: 1714-1758, 1983) about Warburton's litigation. Perhaps it was a hollow threat. A thorough search of the Index of Chancery depositions, Society of Genealogists, would be costly and possibly produce nothing.

WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON

16 February 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.82-83

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have your favour of the 14.<sup>th</sup> and am much indebted to you for your two kind presents & desire the honey may be sent to my house in Town to be keep [sic] in a cool place till I give further orders ab<sup>t</sup> it.

Dr Birch is in the right. I would have a large index.

This morning I rec<sup>d</sup> a letter fro A. Millar. who is at length come about again, and his final resolution is not to have his name to Bol.<sup>s</sup> works, nor to have any thing to do with them. The first good thing in this world is a steady honest man, the next is a sincere penitent.<sup>1</sup> But I would not willingly profess to any but of the first kind, what I do with pleasure to you, that I am

Dear Sir your very affectionate

P.P. Feb 16 1754

Friend W. Warburton

verso [f. 83]: To M<sup>r</sup> J. Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street

Free R: Allen London

frank: 18 FE

<sup>1</sup>Millar's 'penitent' phase cannot have lasted long. The imprint of Mallet's edition of Bolingbroke's Works reads: 'London: Printed for the Editor; and sold by A. Millar, in the Strand; G. Hawkins, near Temple-bar; R. Dodsley, in Pall Mall; and S. Bladon, in Pater-noster-row. MDCCCLIV.' See Egerton 1959.ff.15-16 (1-3 January 1754).



WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]\*

4 March 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.84

Gloucester

Dear Sir

I am perfectly well satisfied with all you have done with M<sup>r</sup> Sayer. I have inclosed his letter to me with my answer which, if you approve, I desire may be sealed & sent by penny-post.

I can depend so much I suppose on D<sup>r</sup> Birch's care & discretion that seeing the sheets of the index (to correct if I find need) before they are worked off will be sufficient. Besides, I can hardly read his hand.

[Para. 3: re: packet sent to Mons. Schmidt.]

I desire that a set of pope small 8<sup>o</sup> with all my notes & Com. bound, and the sermons in boards & this new Ed.<sup>n</sup> of the 1<sup>st</sup> Vol of Div. Leg. in boards may be forthwith packed up and directed as on the other side. and be so good to get it rightly forwarded. I have written to M<sup>r</sup> Schmidt two or three posts ago that I had ordered them.

This morning brought me your favour with the half of the 30<sup>l</sup> note inclosed, of which I have the other half.

I am Dear Sir Your

most affectionate & faithfull

Gloucester March 4 1754

Servant

W. Warburton

WARBURTON to JOHN SAYER\*

4 March 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.87 (copy)

Gloucester

Sir

I have yours of the 22<sup>d</sup> past. My unwillingness to hinder a project that you have judged for your advantage induced me to consent that you might print 500 Copies of your Translation of the Essay on Man, with the Original. But I must desire you to give notice in your Book, that it is done by my express permission; otherwise the [sic] seeing the Original with your Translation might encourage some or other to pirate it. I cannot take it well when I have been so ready to comply thus far, that you should press me to consent to a greater number; which I can by no means do. . . . I know the hazard of literary Projects too well to encourage even my friends and acquaintances in them, much less one to whom I am entirely unknown. Nor Do I think Mr P.s fame, which I should be always desirous of promoting, at all concerned in the matter. If you translate the Poem well, the reputation will be yours; if it be without Success, he loses nothing by the miscarriage. My Civility is paid to you not him. . . . But I perceived by the term of your Letters, you was disposed to see the thing in a different light from what I do: and I was willing to comply as far as in prudence I ought, to what I thought your prejudices.

I have told you my mind without reserve, & am————

—  
S<sup>r</sup> Y<sup>r</sup> very humble Serv<sup>t</sup> —

Gloucester Mar. 4 1754

WW

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

1 June 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.88

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I beg the inclosed may be composed with expedition. You will tell Bowyer that I make a secret of my name. I got down well & think I am better.

ever most Affectionately yours,

P.P. June 1<sup>st</sup> 1754

W. Warburton

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

19 June 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.89

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I have here inclosed a little more copy of the Letter. Be so good to pay the above ten pounds to Mrs Hayes this midsummer.

Pray send me in Leake's parcel one of my Alliances, and one of those letters to Bol: which was printed for the large Pope, & suppressed.

I am Dear Sir

yours most affectionately

P.P. June 19 1754

W. Warburton

P.S.: Recd pages 21 to 36 incl. sent to Boyers [sic]June 21.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>I.e., the proof sheets for the anonymous A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy. Letters First and Second published in 1754.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

23 June 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.90

Prior Park

Dear Sir

If you think it better to print my View of Bolingbroke['s] Philosophy in 8<sup>o</sup> I submit to your better judgment & agree to it, only on this condition that you make it a very beautifull book of it.

I am Dear Sir ever

most affectionately yours

P.P. June 23 1754

W. Warburton

verso: Free R: Allen London postmark: JU/25WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON

2 July 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.92

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I hope you recd my last abt the 4<sup>o</sup> or 8<sup>o</sup>, in which I left the matter entirely to your discretion.

I have inclosed the conclusion of the first letter & the beginning of the second. For I propose to have this view in four Letters. I would not have the end of one and the beginning of another both on the same leaf; neither would I have an entire blank page. I suppose the printer can contrive to prevent either inconvenience.

Dear Sir ever most affectionately yours

P.P. July 2 1754

W. Warburton

Add.: from p. 41. to 56 sent to Bowyerverso: To M<sup>r</sup> J: Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street London

WARBURTON to KNAPTON

25 August 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.95

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I received your favour of yesterday. One of the Letters of the View is now printed, it takes up almost four sheets. I beg you would send for them, and when you have cut away the leaf which begins the second Letter, tack the first Letter together, and send it with the inclosed in a sealed packet to the Arch Bishop. which will oblige,<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir Your most

faithfull &amp; affect: Servt

W. Warburton

P.P. Aug<sup>t</sup> 25 1754

verso: To M<sup>r</sup> Knapton Bookseller in Ludgate Street London

Free R: Allen

Postmark: 22[?] AUG BATH

<sup>1</sup>The first two letters of Warburton's A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy were published by John and Paul Knapton in 1754, comprising 175 pages in octavo. The remaining two letters were published separately in 1755. (See Eg.1954.f.107 below.)

[WARBURTON to KNAPTON]

[mid November 1754?]

BL: Egerton 1959.f.25 (copy)

I have spoken to the A[ttorney General?].<sup>1</sup> He has sent for one Ross<sup>2</sup> a Sol[icito]<sup>r</sup> to come to him. To him he will give his orders to write to Scotland to retain Sol.<sup>rs</sup> & Council—and to begin the pros[ecution]. immediately in the court of sessions—but for nothing but what is within the Act of Q[ueen]. Anne—that the L<sup>d</sup> Advocate should be retained—and him he will speak with when he comes to Town.

—All this I foresaw. But as it was thought necessary to have the A[ttorney] G[eneral]. 's advise [sic]: there was a necessity of submitting to it in all things—As for my part as far as threatening & commencing a prosecution goes I am for it. But no farther. Neither my property nor my inclination will make it worth my while to be engaged in a tedious Law-suit To all of which I have an utter aversion —It is a different case with men who have great property. —If the principal Booksellers will consider it as a common cause & join in I wish their contributions well & good.

<sup>1</sup>This abbreviated form probably refers to William Murray, the Attorney General. This draught is undated and unsigned, although it more than likely predates Egerton 1959.ff.23-24 (28 November 1754) below.

<sup>2</sup>George Ross, the Conduit Street solicitor retained by Murray, is the recipient of Egerton 1959.ff.23-24.



ROBERT FOULIS to [WARBURTON]

27 November 1754

BL: Egerton 1959.f.17

Glasgow

Reverend Sir,

What I have to say in answer to yours,  
I have done myself the honour to address to the  
Attorney-General.<sup>1</sup>

I am

Sir

Your most Obed<sup>t</sup>: Humble Servt:

Robert Foulis

Glasgow

27th Nov<sup>r</sup> 1754

<sup>1</sup>William Murray, 1st Earl Mansfield (1705-93).  
He was the Solicitor-General from 1742-54 and served  
as the Attorney-General from 1754-56 during the Duke  
of Newcastle's ministry. In 1763 he presided as Lord  
Chief Justice over the Wilkes case. Dedicatee of  
Epistle I vi, Murray had been tutored in oratory by  
Pope.

At one time, Murray acted as counsel for Glasgow  
University which presented him with an honorary LL.D.  
in 1754.

RONALD CRAWFURD to GEORGE ROSS, ESQ. 28 November 1754  
BL: Egerton 1959.ff.23-24 (copy) Edinburgh

Edinburgh 28 Nov<sup>r</sup> 1754

D<sup>r</sup> Sir,

I wrote you last post that I was in hope to get an appointment made with Lord Advocate & Mr Lockhart, to have known how we are to proceed in Dr Warburton's Affairs; but I will not be able to obtain the Meeting for a day or two. I wrote you that it was proper the Probate of Mr Pope's Will should be sent down, with a Certificate that the Books were entered in Stationer's Hall, the Universities &c. Agreeable to the Act of the 8<sup>th</sup> of the Queen, for the Encouragement of Learning; but on considering a little more on this affair, I find myself without sufficient Materials, for carrying on this Prosecution.

Mr Pope by his Will only gives the Doctor, such Books as he hath written, or shall write Commentaries upon, which he has not otherwise disposed of or alienated. This seems to imply as if Mr Pope had alienated the property of some of his Works. It will be necessary therefore that a particular List or Schedule of such part of the Works as Dr Warburton apprehends to be his property, and to fall under the Will, be sent me, with the Probate and Certificate, so as the Action or Complaint be properly laid.—It becomes the more necessary that care be taken, the Lybell be properly laid, for in looking to the fore-

said Act of the 8<sup>th</sup> of the Queen, I observe that the Author of all Books composed after the vico, has the sole privilege of printing &c for 14 years after publication of the Book; and after the Expiry of 14 years, if the Author shall be then alive, the Sole Right & Privilege of printing shall return to him for another Term of 14 years.—Now if any of Mr Pope's Works were published preceding the vico (which I believe was the case as to some of his early Writings, his puerilities as he terms them or if any of his later Works, the first Term of 14 years from the Publication was not expired at the time of his death, then I apprehend the exclusive Privilege determined on the Lapse of the first Term, and even as to the 2<sup>d</sup> Term of 14 years, tho' the Act gives the Author if Living, the privilege for a 2<sup>d</sup> term of the years; yet I have a doubt if on his Death, such a Privilege is assignable for what part of the 2<sup>d</sup> term may be then to run. It seems to be only personal, to the Author himself, but not to his Executors or Assigns; and it would be proper that Dr Warburton make out a distinct memorial of this matter, with a condescendence of the particular Books, he apprehends to be his property, the dates of their publication to shew whether the Terms were expired, or not, at Mr Pope's death, or if they are expired since. And also that he will distinguish what part of Mr Pope's Works were alienated before his death. I believe the Entry in Stationer's Hall is not material except we were suing for the Penalties, which I appreciate is not the Case, but for Damages, and to stop

the printing.<sup>1</sup>

We are very much Strangers here to the particulars of the Laws in relation to the property of Books. It came to be lookt into a little in the Action you mention, that Andrew Millar and the Booksellers of London brought against the Booksellers of Edinburgh.<sup>2</sup> But as it must be well understood in England, where it is **so much** a matter of property, and where many Actions must have been brought, I think it would be right that D<sup>r</sup> Warburton laid his Case before the Attorney General, for opinion, and that he transmit such opinion for our Government and direction, together with such Title (if he has established it) as entitles him to the Property of the Works, Certificate of Entry in Stationer's Hall, with a particular condescendance of the Books pirated, of which he claims the property, the date of publication &c, In Short Such Evidence as would found & support him, were the action to be brought and tried in Westminster Hall, for 'till I have such Materials, it is not practicable to make a proper Lybell, for less can it found us in applying for a Prohibition or Injunction to stop the others from Printing. And indeed I wish I

<sup>1</sup>That is, by Robert Foulis in Glasgow. See Egerton 1959.f.20 above.

<sup>2</sup>Andrew Millar launched the first test-case over copy-right in Scotland in December 1738 when he instructed his solicitor to issue summonses against twenty-nine Scottish booksellers. He claimed he had a right in common law to Thomson's Seasons and wanted £100 from each of the book-sellers. He dropped his case in 1739, but later returned, backed by sixteen London booksellers (including John and Paul Knapton, Thomas Longman and John Rivington), in 1743. This long drawn-out battle ended unsuccessfully in the Edinburgh Court of Session in 1749. See Warren McDougall, 'Gavin Hamilton, John Balfour and Patrick Neill: a study of publishing in Edinburgh in the 18th century', Ph.D. thesis (Edinburgh, 1974), chapter IV, 85-102.

had delayed making an appointment with our Lawyers, till I heard further from you or from the Doctor, as it is putting us to an unnecessary Expence at present, 'till I can lay more of the matter before them.

You will communicate to D<sup>r</sup> Warburton what I now write, and assure him of my best Offices and Endeavours to serve him, to which his Merit and Labours for the Publick entitle him. Besides its being accompanied with a Recommendation from the Attorney General which will always have the greatest weight with me<sup>3</sup>

I am D<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup>

Your most obliged

& obed<sup>t</sup> Serv<sup>t</sup>

Ronald Crawford

verso: To George Ross Esq on Conduit Street

Mr Crawford's Letter Nov. 28

<sup>3</sup> 'William Warburton, claiming the copyright of the Works of Alexander Pope, objected when Robert Foulis was printing Pope's Letters in 1754, but on Foulis's writing to Attorney-General William Murray, Warburton was advised to come to a financial settlement.' Warren McDougall, 'Gavin Hamilton, John Balfour and Patrick Neill', pp. 101-02.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]\*

6 December 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.102

Prior Park

P.P. Dec<sup>r</sup> 6 1754

Dear Sir

[Para. 1: passim, extraneous financial matters]

[Para. 2 begins:] I inclose two Letters from the two Scotch Booksellers to me.<sup>1</sup> with my answer to one of them, by which you will see my sentiments of both. when you have read my Letter and taken a copy of it, I beg you would seal & send it by the Post.

I desire our friend M<sup>r</sup> Mason may have a copy of the Div. Legation in boards, and the Bp of Chester the same.

I am Dear Sir your

you will not forget

most affectionate &amp; faithfull

the parcel into Germany

friend W. Warburton

verso: Since the writing what is within I have not only rec<sup>d</sup> yours with the two Letters from Ross & Crawford,<sup>2</sup>

but like wise two from the Attorney-General. Foulis'

letter to him & a Copy of his Answer,—altogether, with

the rigour & alertness of the prosecution if they persist

will I hope soon end this affair—All must be left to your

discretion in which I repose my selfe and authorize all you

think proper. One thing only I would recommend as they are

willing to desist one would make the terms of submission as

easy to them as we can.—I am sure you will rejoice in the

attorney's Letter as it is relative to all property and as

he seems to make it a point to establish it for the good

of Letters.

<sup>1</sup>Robert and Andrew Foulis. <sup>2</sup>See Eg.1959.ff. 23-24, 25.



ROBERT FOULIS to WILLIAM MURRAY

20 December 1754

BL: Egerton 1959.f.20

Glasgow

Honourable Sir,

I had the honour and favour of yours and ask pardon for presuming to give you this further trouble, at a season of the year, when you cannot have much time to spare for matters of so small a consequence.

I am not altogether unacquainted with the history of Monopolies granted by Princes to authors, Editors, Printers and Booksellers. I have had likewise occasion to examine the new doctrine by which authors are supposed to be vested with a property, not only antecedent to all acts of parliaments, but even such as an one as claims indefeasibility, and refuses to be limited by the highest national authority.

I will not offer to trouble you with this subject at present, but shall be extremely glad at a Season when you are more at leisure to do it fully and freely, not with a view to hurt but to serve Learning. I shall only beg leave to take notice, that no Bookseller ever purchases the work of an author, without hopes of being indemnified by the first edition.

Milton, or any English author, could not only have been printed in Scotland until the Union of the Kingdoms, but even to the last Act of Queen Anne: And at present they have a right to print what ever they are not forbid

by that Act. As in Ireland they can print all without exception, I don't find that the best men among them make any scruple to encourage it; and I know the most Learned and worthy men in this country, think we do public service in reprinting, whatever we can according to Law, that is any way calculated to do good.

Tho' I have taken this Liberty, that you may see I act from principle, yet I must own it gives me a great deal of pain, that any action of mine should have given you so much trouble; nothing could have been more contrary to my intentions, wherever the blame may be; all that I can now do to repair it, is with your permission to lay aside the design. Private profit is what I have too much undervalued in my other undertakings, to regard it in the present circumstances.

As I did not doubt the truth of the message, I readily presumed you had obtained D<sup>r</sup> Warburton's consent, and was afraid that I should rather have given offence, by being too remiss than too forward. No part of M<sup>r</sup> Pope's works are as yet printed but his Miscellanies, except half the first Volume of his Letters, which I know by experience I can sell to young students & others who cannot afford to buy the works.

As I am entirely to be directed by you, if you order I will go on with the edition, which consists of a thousand copies, and oblige myself to give D<sup>r</sup>. Warburton what proportion of the impression you approve, for his consent,

but however you determine, I beg it may be without any regard to my interest. What I put a value upon, and a high one, is your kind intention. I ask pardon for the freedom and length of this, and beg leave to subscribe myself with the most respectful submission and gratitude,

Honourable Sir,

Your most Obliged &  
most Obedient Serv.<sup>t</sup>

Glasgow

20. Dec<sup>r</sup> 1754

Robert Foulis

P.S. I have been long known to Lord Selkirk, and Lord Cathcart, both as to my way of thinking and acting, to whom I refer if you choose to take the trouble of enquiring. RF

WILLIAM MURRAY to WARBURTON

28 December 1754

BL: Egerton 1959.f.18

Kenwood

Kenwood 28th Dec<sup>r</sup> 1754

Dear Sir

I have just received the inclosed<sup>1</sup> to which I have returned a very civil Answer & applauded his Behaviour but thrown out some Objections to his general Reasoning. I have s<sup>d</sup> I wou'd immediately send his Letter to you & desire you to write to him. I shou'd be very sorry to have the Question [?] agitated first in Scotland; besides the great Expence it may involve you in & therefore I think you shou'd consider his Behaviour as handsome & close with him upon generous Terms for the Edition of 1000, taking an Engagement that He will print no more. & the Title Page must show it to be an Edition authorized by you. My best compliments to Mr Allen & many thanks for the Guinea Hens He was so good as to send me. I am D<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup>

Ever &amp; most aff[ectionately] Yrs &amp;c.

W: Murray

<sup>1</sup>Murray has enclosed Foulis's letter of 20 December 1754 (Egerton 1959.f.20 above) concerning the printing and publishing of Pope's works in Scotland. In light of Andrew Millar's long and costly experience at the Edinburgh Court of Session, first from 1738-39 and later from 1743-49, Murray is strongly advising Warburton against taking any legal action.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

30 December 1754

BL: Egerton 1954.f.104 (fragment)

Prior Park

I need not explain the nature of the two inclosed.<sup>1</sup> If the Attorney insists on those terms from Foulis we must I think comply. You, perhaps, have properer [property?] to urge. I have writ to the Attorney to this effect that he knows you have part of the property with me. That you manage all the affairs. That you are ready to take directions, as I am. And that you will wait on him.

Dear Sir

ever most affectionately

Yours

P.P. Dec<sup>r</sup> 30 1754

W. Warburton

P.S.: It runs in my head it will be better to let Foulis print a part of Pope's works upon terms [rather] than the whole and since this seems to satisfy him, if the Attorney will be satisfied too it would be best. But he must be satisfied.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The two letters Warburton has enclosed are presumably Robert Foulis's letter to William Murray (Eg.1959.f.20; 20 December 1754) and Murray's letter to Warburton (Eg.1959.f.18; 28 December 1754). Murray, the Attorney-General, has enclosed Foulis's letter in his letter to Warburton.

<sup>2</sup>A notice for the Foulis Essay on Man appeared in the Scots Magazine, XII (February 1751), p. 112. The price was six-pence.

WARBURTON to JOHN KNAPTON

12 January 1755

BL: Egerton 1954.ff.105-06

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I recd you two last Letters. I am glad to understand that your cold is almost gone.

The affair with Foulis goes on very well, & you have writ him a very proper Letter.

To tell you truth I neither like Law litigations, nor soliciting my friends to secure my property of this kind, besides I could do this with a better grace. as well as more readiness for another than for my selfe. All this considered I have thought when we settled all matters ab<sup>t</sup> Pope to dispose of my property in it, of which you may be sure you should have the refusal: nor shall I ever be the less warm to assist you at all times to the best of my power to the better security of your property. But I shall be determined, in this intention, by your advise.

I propose being in town the week after next. I wish you would send me the 3<sup>d</sup> part of Alexander the corrector just published.

I am Dear Sir Most affectionately

P.P. Jan. 12 1755 Yours W. Warburton

verso: The 3<sup>d</sup> pt of Alexander the Corrector need not be sent

verso f.106: Dr. Warburton's Letter of Jan. 12. abt Pope & JK's answer 15<sup>th</sup>



[early 1755?]

Transcript from a Letter from Edinburgh to a Gentleman  
in London

BL: Egerton 1959.f.22

Mr Dalton of Glasgow came to Town last night, and tells me that He and Foulis are printing Pope's Works compleat, and that they have got a Letter from a Patron of Mr Warburton's, encouraging them to it, and an Edition is likewise printing in Edinburgh, and that both are advanced some volumes.

Edinburgh at Murray & Cochrane and in Fleming's printing house, upon the Risk of Donaldson and young Fleming——<sup>1</sup>

[No indication of writer or recipient]

<sup>1</sup>Murray and Cochrane as well as Alexander Donaldson and Robert Fleming are cited in the index to Philip Gaskell's Bibliography of the Foulis Press. I have yet to find any information about Dalton whose name has almost been blotted out. Warburton's patron is presumably Murray.

WARBURTON to [KNAPTON]

18 January 1755

BL: Egerton 1954.f.107

Prior Park

Dear Sir

I would have this 3<sup>d</sup> Letter of the View out as soon as it can.<sup>1</sup> I have sent Bowyer all the copy, and have all the copy written for the preface which will make between 2 & 3 sheets which with ab<sup>t</sup> 7 of the Letter will make such a pamphlet as the other.

I have your answer to my Last and I shall always do every thing that may be most conducive to the security of your very considerable property.

I am Dear Sir ever

most Affectionately yours

P.P. Jan 18 1755

W. Warburton

<sup>1</sup>That is, the third letter (out of four) of A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy. The first two letters, printed for John and Paul Knapton in 1754, filled 175 pages in octavo; the third, published in 1755, ran to 179 pages. The fourth and last critique of Bolingbroke's Works appeared in the same year.

[WILLIAM BOWYER to JOHN KNAPTON]

20 September 1755

Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, II, 278-79

I was last night informed that it was reported I had advised taking out a statute against you. As no one, I am persuaded, hath a deeper sense of obligations to you, or feels more for your present troubles, I was shocked at this charge of ingratitude and inhumanity. I knew, with the rest of the world, that your good-nature only had brought you into your present difficulties, and that your affliction under them arose more from the inconveniencies you brought on others than on yourself. It must add not a little to your disquiet, to think you have a monster among your creditors: but I owe it both to you and them to testify that you can have but one; for I never heard any of them propose taking a step which might ill suit your inclinations; or, what was more tender, your credit. If a statute was ever mentioned, it was feared only from the intricacy of your affairs, not suggested from the malevolence of any heart. I say this, to clear others, not myself; for it is too much for me to think that such an imputation should live, and be carried to your ear. My heart, Sir, will ever wish you happiness; but for fear it should fall under any misconstruction of it after so bad a representation of it, I must beg you will give me leave to renounce the office of being one of your trustees, in

which it will be impossible for me after this to act with freedom, though I intend ever so uprightly. I know not whether another trustee must be chosen in my place; but, if there must, whatever additional expence that may occasion, I will thankfully defray. I would further beg, that no enquiry be made who propagated the story of me; for as I suspect no one person, so I would continue to harbour no ill thoughts of any particular; and I will rest satisfied in the persuasion you will ever retain your good ones, of, Sir,

Your sincere friend and most humble servant, W.B.

I would have waited on you with the inclosed renunciation, but that I am hastening into the country.

WARBURTON to HURD

24 September 1755

Hurd, Letters, LXXXIII, 143-44

Bedford Row

I Received your most tender letter, and sympathize with you most heartily.—Let me have better news.

A very disagreeable affair has brought me to town a month before my usual time. Mr. Knapton, whom every body, and I particularly, thought the richest bookseller in town, has failed. His debts are £20,000, and his stock is valued at £30,000, but this value is subject to many abating contingencies: and you never at first hear the whole debt. It is hoped there will be enough to pay every one. I don't know what to say to it. It is a business of years. He owes me a great sum. I am his principal creditor. And as such I have had it in my power, at a meeting of his creditors, to dispose them favourably to him, and to get him treated with great humanity and compassion. I have brought them to agree unanimously to take a resignation of his effects, to be managed by trustees, and in the mean time, till the effects can be disposed of to the best advantage, which will be some years in the doing, to allow him a very handsome subsistence. For I think him an honest man (though he has done extreme ill by me), and, as such, love him. He falls with the pity and compassion of every body. His fault was extreme indolence. I was never more satisfied in any action of my life than in my service of Mr. Knapton on this

occasion, and the preventing (which I hope I have done) his being torn in pieces. Yet you must not be surprised, I am sure I should not, if you hear (so great is the world's love of truth and of me), that my severity to him destroyed his credit, and would have pushed him to extremity. I will assure you you have heard many things of me full as true: which though at present Apocryphal, may, by my never contradicting them, in time become holy-writ, as the Poet says. God bless you, and believe me to be, &c.

Bedford-Row, September 24th, 1755.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Part of John Knapton's stock and copyrights were sold on the following day (Thursday 25 September 1755) at the Queen's-Head Tavern in Paternoster Row. See the catalogue in Appendix D.



WARBURTON to [JOHN KNAPTON?]

31 October 1755

BL: Egerton 1959.f.27

Oct.<sup>r</sup> 31<sup>t</sup> 1755

I have only two things to say to M<sup>r</sup> Lintot that if he thinks he has any claim to any part of the property of the Dunciad he must prosecute it by Law; his claim to the present profits must be made on M<sup>r</sup> Knapton & his trustees and I shall give them a bond of indemnity.

If he attempts to print the Dunciad or any part of it at any time I shall immediate[ly] print the Homer to which I likewise have a dormant claim, with improvements in the version & additions to the notes, both of which I have ready.<sup>1</sup>

W.W.

<sup>1</sup>Henry Lintot, one of the proprietors of the 1751 Works, bought the full copyright of the Dunciad on 15 December 1740 against Pope's wishes. Pope lodged a complaint in Chancery on 16 February 1743 (PRO C11 549/39). (See Corr. IV, 240, 333 n.1, 394, 425 n.5, 455 and n.4; also Twick. V, xxxiv-xxxv.)

Lintot is again trying to publish the Dunciad, and Warburton is firmly putting his foot down. The threat against Lintot's intended publication of Pope's Iliad and Odyssey (by adding notes, commentaries, variations and such, thereby giving the editor a claim to the share of profits) apparently dissuaded the bookseller from going ahead with his Dunciad scheme.

WARBURTON to THE REVD DR ATWELL\*

9 December 1755

BL: Egerton 1955.f.34

Prior Park

Dear Sir,

When I came back hither from London I understood you came to Bath soon after I had left the Country; being summoned to Town a month before my usual time on a very disagree[e]able occasion, the failing of my Bookseller, who was indebted to me in a large sum of money. He is a very honest Man: and I had then the satisfaction of recommending him very effectually to the favour of his creditors, when the prospect of his affairs presented a very ill face. Matters have since borne a better aspect, and he is likely to have a considerable surplusage.

[Warburton then goes on to discuss church matters and reflects on the Lisbon earthquake.]

verso: Free R: Allen

[Overleaf: Warburton's letter to Robert Dodsley  
concerning shares in Pope's works, 26 December 1755,  
Edinburgh University Library La.II.153.]

WARBURTON to ROBERT DODSLEY

26 December 1755

EUL: La.II.153

[Prior Park]

M<sup>r</sup> Dodsley

Let us not be misunderstood. When you came to me in Town, I told you, whenever I sold my whole property in Pope I would contrive if possible you should have some share. And I remember very well, as I found you disposed to understand this as a promise to let you have some share when I sold any, I set you right, & repeated to you again that my meaning was when I parted with the whole. For at that time, I had determined with my selfe to employ Mr Millar & Mr Draper in my concerns. I had my reasons on account of my knowledge of them, & affairs I have had with them. They had always done every thing to my satisfaction. And I must have things done my own way. On which account I sold, what I did sell to them, much cheaper than they bought of Mr Knapton.

You will ask me then how I came to say I would contrive, if possible, that you should have some share when I sold the whole! It was partly on your importunity; partly out of regard I have for your Brother here;<sup>1</sup> & partly because Mr Pope had a regard for you: tho, as I told you, I thought you had not been very regardful of the memory of a man to whom you was so much obliged.

<sup>1</sup>Isaac Dodsley was Ralph Allen's gardener.

But as you [mention] Mr Millar in a complaining way, I must tell you, you do him much injury to think you had any right to any part of that he bought of me or Mr Knapton. I chose him preferably to another: I chose him because I would have to do with no other, but of my own appointment, and had he, (because you had told him of your willingness to be concerned with him in purchasing some share of Pope) let you have any which he purchased, without my knowledge & consent he had broke his word with me & violated his reputation. I am not a person to be bought & sold. Mr Knapton, who is an honest & a virtuous & a gratefull man, would have suffered me to be as much master of the sale of his part of this property as if it had been my own. And it is with men of that character only, that I hope I shall ever be concerned.

You will do Mr Millar & me but justice, (a justice which I must expect of you) to communicate the contents of this to him: and that if you have said any thing contrary to these contents (which in every part is exactly true) that you would own your selfe mistaken.

Dec.<sup>r</sup> 26 1755

I am your very humble Servt

W. Warburton

ROBERT and ANDREW FOULIS to ANDREW MILLAR 2 September 1756

EUL: Dc. 4. 102

Glasgow

N5833S

22/25 Sept

£20 Sterling

Glasgow Sept.<sup>r</sup> 1756

Sir,

Please pay to James Dychman & company twenty days  
after date ye sum of twenty pounds Sterl: value in paper  
furnished for printing Pope's Works as advised by, Sir,

To M<sup>r</sup> Andrew Millar  
Bookseller in London

Your most humble Serv<sup>ts</sup>  
Robert & Andrew Foulis<sup>1</sup>

verso: [Bear?] the Contents to Mess[rs] Kennedy & Bell  
on order

James Dichman [sic] & Co.

Kennedy & Bell

Peter Johnson

Thos Browne [son?]

To Jn Smith [?]

The Bond Reced

Witness John Allison

For Wm Gibson

<sup>1</sup>Having settled with Warburton over the publication  
of Pope's works in Scotland, the Foulis brothers seem to  
be reimbursing Warburton's new bookseller, Andrew Millar,  
for the privilege.



JONATHAN TOUP to JOHN NOURSE

24 October 1766

EUL: La. II.646.255

St. Martins 24 Oct.

Sir,

I had a letter yesterday from Mr Bowyer. he says he cannot undertake my Crit. Epistle for want of able compositors. he is angry, I find, about my late Inscript-ion to the Bp of Gloucester. But what has Mr Bowyer to do with the squabbles of Bp. W. & his antagonists? I have wrote him again by this post, & desired he would undertake this, as well as the former. I would have you talk with him about it, & let me know. I could send the copy up immediately. If he will not, we must look out for some other hand; but would much rather have him. I hope when his passion subsides he will come again to himself.

I am your most obedt Servt.

Jo. Toup.

P.S.: I have found Mr Reirke has published his Animadvers. on Diogenes, Laertius, & I see by ye paper you have Greg-de [D]ialectis. I should be glad of both. you may send them to Mr Woodley of Norfolk Street, who will sned me a box soon.

verso: To: Mr John Nourse Opposite Catherine Street  
in the Strand London [St] Martin 24 Octr 1766 The  
Revd Mr Toup answerd Novr 22<sup>1</sup>  
[Franked OC]

<sup>1</sup>Jonathan or Johannes Toup (1713-85) was a philologist and classical editor. At Exeter College, Oxford, his tutor was John Upton. His Epistola Critica (1767) was inscribed to Warburton (DNB). See also Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, II, 340.

WARBURTON to MESSRS GOSLING AND CLIVE

22 December 1772

NLS: MSS.968.f.74

Gloucester

Gloucester Dec<sup>r</sup> 22 1772

To Messrs Gosling &amp; Clive

Sirs

be pleased to pay to John Pitt Esq. on order  
three days after sight the sum of one hundred and  
sixty two pounds and place it to my account.<sup>1</sup>

W. Warburton

162 £add: [another, possibly Gosling's, hand] Acctt<sup>d</sup> 12 Jan<sup>y</sup>

GG

D12

<sup>1</sup>John Pitt, a favourite cousin of the Prime Minister, was a sometimes guest of Prior Park. Warburton's wife Gertrude visited Mrs Pitt in Dorset in August 1754. See Benjamin Boyce, The Benevolent Man: a life of Ralph Allen of Bath (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p. 222.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **ABSTRACTS OF ACCOUNTS FOR POPE'S WORKS**

## APPENDIX B: ACCOUNTS OF POPE'S WORKS

Soon after each edition was published and distributed, an account sheet was drawn up to give a tally of the profits for each proprietor. The accounts given in Appendix B survey the first five Warburton editions. On the verso of one of the accounts is written 'Mr Draper's Acct of Pope' which calculates the total profits on Pope's Works between 1751 and 1754; this may have been drawn up at the time of John Knapton's financial troubles.

From these accounts we know the number of sets of each edition published, the breakdown of shares amongst the proprietors, and the total amount of profits made. The most detailed record surviving is the abstract of accounts for the large octavo edition of 1752. On 3 August 1752 Warburton wrote to Knapton, 'I agree with you that it is better to deferr the publication of the new 8<sup>o</sup> till more company comes to Towne', and by 15 October the editor has noted a few corrections to be kept for future reference, so the edition was probably published in late September.<sup>1</sup> The account for this edition is dated 17 January 1753 - time enough for consignments to be distributed and payments received from booksellers

<sup>1</sup>Appendix A: Egerton 1954.ff.45, 52.

who dealt with the Knaptons.

750 nine-volume sets of the 1752 edition were printed (half the number of the first large octavo edition). Production costs, wholesale prices, and profits were calculated according to the number of sheets and pages printed. The 1752 edition ran to 193 sheets and 12 pages per set. Warburton and the Knaptons had the lion's share of 147 sheets and 7 pages per set, or  $570\frac{2}{3}$  sets out of 750, which translates into roughly 77% of all the books produced. The percentages for the other partners work out approximately thus: 6% for Tonson and Co. (12 sheets, 11 pages); 12% for Henry Lintot (24 sheets, 10 pages; and 5% for Charles Bathurst (9 sheets even).

The production costs - or to put it another way, printers' bill - came to 14s.  $2\frac{1}{4}$ d. per set. Each sheet cost about 0.81d. which is above the range given by Gaskell of 0.35d.-0.65d. (or an average of 0.5d.) per sheet in the mid eighteenth century.<sup>2</sup> The reason for the high cost may have been Warburton's unusually obstinate demands and frequent reprintings. The total printing costs reached £532 0s. 10d. As Bowyer was the only likely printer for the job, perhaps his rates were exceptional in this case. Judging by the ornaments in

<sup>2</sup>Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 178-79. See also Patricia Hernlund, 'William Strahan's Printing Ledgers', *Studies in Bibliography*, XX (1967), 89-111, and its follow-up in XXII (1969), 179-95.

volumes VI and VII, we find Bowyer sent out part of the 1752 edition to William Strahan.

After all the production charges (e.g. cost of paper, ink, payments to compositors and pressmen, miscellaneous expenses)<sup>3</sup> had been taken into account, the proprietors fixed a wholesale price of 33s. Thus they more than doubled their outlay on production costs. The proprietors would also have sold a fair number of sets in their in shops, in which case their profits would have almost trebled.

The retail price of the 1752 edition was £2 2s. Thus the bookseller who bought a set from the wholesaler at 33s. stood to make almost a 25% profit on a sale to his customer. By the 1750s the book trade was sufficiently well organized that profit margins from printer to wholesaler to retailer were relatively standardized. Occasionally, if an edition were not selling well, the bookseller might lower his price to his customers, thereby reducing his own profits; on the other hand, a buyer in the provinces

<sup>3</sup>For an interesting but atypical account of an edition, see the record of the Vice-chancellor's expenditures and receipts for Sir Thomas Hanmer's edition of Shakespeare (1744) in Harry Carter's A History of the Oxford University Press, volume I: to the year 1780 (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1975), p. 304. The paper - 560 reams of Royal - took up two-thirds of the production costs (£800 out of £1,283 14s. 6d.). Miscellaneous expenses include: a corrector's journey to London (£2 2s.); payment to Gravelot for engraving (£14 14s.); correctors (a surprisingly large sum of £84); new type from Caslon's 1742 specimen sheet (£39 2s.); and, not to be missed, 'For the pressmen to drink Sir Tho. Hanmer's health' (£2 2s.). For delivering copies, Wood the pressman was paid £6 6s.; the charge for binding and delivering Sir Thomas's copy was £6 1s.



or abroad might have to pay substantially more (to offset transportation charges and accommodate for the profits of second- or third-hand retailers) than the London list price.

The main proprietors were obviously the greatest benefactors: their profits ran well over 100%. Charles Bathurst, with the smallest (a 5% cut of the edition) more than doubled his outlay on production costs, raking in £57 15s. for his £24 16s. 9d. investment, leaving him with a gross profit of £32 18s. His contact with the lengthy operation, his involvement in day-to-day grist work (including initial negotiations, commissioning artists, checking up on the printers, and publicizing the edition) would have been minimal. Bathurst seems to have been a fairly 'silent' partner who was given his share after the 1751 editions had been published. Possibly all that he did was to invest his capital and collect his profits a few years later.

Warburton and the Knaptons split their share three ways with Warburton taking a two-thirds part. Out of the overall profits, Warburton took just over 50%, leaving the Knaptons with a little more than 25%; the others divided the remaining 23%. That the editor should be granted a half-share of the entire profits of the first five editions is unusual - perhaps it was unique for its time - but then Warburton was in the most advantageous position. He could

dictate which booksellers would publish the edition. Pope's literary property, well-barnacled with footnotes, was now Warburton's property, and his was a seller's market. Any bookseller in London would have been glad to have a stake in the Works; it was guaranteed profit. Warburton may have put up some capital along with the others. The title page of the small octavo of 1751 carries the phrase 'Published by Mr. Warburton' over the imprint which suggests at least some financial backing. In an undated letter (Egerton 1954.f.36), Warburton complains about unanticipated expenses: 'I am by no means satisfied with paying more for the present books of pope's [sic] works, than paper & print; besides binding.' Thinking himself 'very hardly used', Warburton reminds Knapton of his editorial command over the Works: 'Now could the other proprietors grudge it as I make their property so much better by inserting it into a compleat Ed<sup>n</sup> of the works.' Warburton, unversed in the commercial side of publishing (as Egerton 1954.ff.3-7 suggest; Warburton is 'bit by my own folly' in a transaction with Millar and Draper), had the enviable position of being financially secure outside the trade (through his living and his marriage) and guaranteed of making a profit within it (through his bequest from Pope).

From the abstract of accounts for the 1752 large octavo edition and the overall profits of the first five editions,

we can construct a fairly accurate estimation of the first large octavo edition of 1751. The number of sheets printed per set is the same from 1751 to 1752 (although there are two pages more in the 1752 Works); and the number of 1752 sets is exactly half of the 1751 impression. So multiplying the production costs, wholesale prices, and profits by two will give us the following projection:

ABSTRACT OF ACCOUNTS FOR THE 1751 LARGE OCTAVO WORKS (9 VOLS)

	Sets	Printing Cost	Selling Price	Profit
Warburton & Knapton	1141 $\frac{1}{3}$	809.12.8	1883.04	1073.11.04
Tonson & Co.	98	69.10.5	161.14	92.03.07
Lintot	190 $\frac{2}{3}$	135.05.1	314.12	179.06.11
Draper	<u>70</u>	<u>49.13.6</u>	<u>115.10</u>	<u>65.16.06</u>
	1500	1064.01.8	2475.00	1410.18.04
				<u>1064.01.08</u>
				2475.00.00

The actual gross profit for the 1751 edition, according to the overall abstract of accounts, was £1380.9s. 5d., about thirty pounds less than the estimated profit above. This discrepancy is too slight to affect these calculations greatly, although it does point out one interesting comparison between 1751 and 1752. Production costs did not change much from one edition to the next, although the job itself should have been somewhat easier the second time

around. However, the large octavo 1752 edition seems to have been more hastily produced than its 1751 precursor. Misprints such as, 'Of thousand bright Inhabitants of Air!', were corrected in the later editions, although Warburton made a note of the misprints in the 1752 edition in his letter of 15 October 1752 (see Appendix A). We might add to these the jump in pagination in the third volume from page 62 to page 73 and the striking 'EPILOGUE TO THE SATITES' half-title in the fourth volume (p. 297). When Bowyer's work was less than satisfactory, Warburton made him well aware of it (see Appendix A, 12 December 1748, p. 12).

In what manner Warburton received his share of the profits is open to speculation. He drew money from the Knaptons on various occasions and asked them to invest in annuities in his name. As Warburton seems to have been John Knapton's biggest creditor in 1755, it seems likely that Warburton left most of his profits in Knapton's charge.

. . . . .

N.B.: After transcribing some of these records from the Egerton collection, I discovered that G.F. Papali had done the same years before me in his Jacob Tonson, Publisher: his Life and Work (1656-1736) (New Zealand, 1968), pp. 222-23. However, his main concern is with the Tonsons' share, and his figures (and reference number) are not entirely accurate.

. . . . .

BOWYER'S ACCOUNT FOR POPE'S 1717 WORKS<sup>1</sup>

[1717 Mr Bernard Lintot Dr]

May 22

For Pope's Works 4 <sup>to</sup> No $\left. \begin{smallmatrix} 500 \\ 250 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ 750 viz',	}	44:05:—
59 Sheets intire at 15s. P Sheet		
The Title in red & black		00:10:—
5 Forms 4 <sup>to</sup> wrought Headpieces at 5s each		1:05:—
$\left. \begin{smallmatrix} 125 \\ 63 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ Titles red & black with Mr. Tonson's Name		10:—
D <sup>o</sup> in Fol. No. $\left. \begin{smallmatrix} 1000 \\ & 250 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ 1250 with Margins		
alter'd viz. 110 Sh. & $\frac{1}{2}$ at 12s: 6d. P. Sh		69:01: 3
The Titles red & black for the fine Paper		
with Alterations		10:—
5 Forms wrought Headpieces for the fine Paper		12: 6

<sup>1</sup>This account is found in J. D. Fleeman's article, '18th-century Printing Ledgers', Times Literary Supplement (19 December 1963), p. 1056. The original is in the Grolier Club archives, Bowyer Ledger I, fol. 8<sup>v</sup>, a photocopy of which is kept at the Bodleian Library.

HENRY WOODFALL'S ACCOUNT FOR POPE'S 1735 WORKS (8<sup>o</sup>)\*

"Mr. Bernard Lintot, Dr.

Dec. 15, 1735	Printing the first volume of	£	s.	d.
	Mr. Pope's Works, cr.			
	Long Primer 8vo., No.			
	pd. for	21.		
	3000 (and 75 fine), at 21.2s.			
Received, Jan.	per sht., 14 shts. and a			
15, 173 $\frac{5}{6}$ ,	31. 10s. half - - - - -	30	09	0
for fine paper,	Title in red and black	1	01	0
and the print:	Paid for two reams of $\frac{1}{4}$ of			
so that put the	writing demy - - - - -	2	16	3
whole at 21.	Received, Sept. 3, 1737.			
per sht.	Notes for this. Paid.			

Mr. Henry Lintot, Dr.

April 30, 1736	Printing the third volume			
	of Pope's Works, cr. Long			
	Primer 8vo., No. 3000,			
	and 75 fine, at 21. 2s. pr.			
	sht., 13 shts. - - - - -	27	06	0
	Title in red and black - - - -	1	01	0
	Paid for two reams of writ-			
	ing demy - - - - -	2	10	0
	Paid for Ovid's Metam. and Statius	0	03	0
Received, Sept. 3, 1737.	Notes for this. Paid.			

\*from Notes and Queries; 1st series, vol. 11 (19 May 1855), 377.



ABSTRACT OF ACCOUNTS FOR THE 1752 LARGE OCTAVO EDITION OF POPE'S WORKS (NINE VOLUMES)

BL: Egerton 1959.f.29

17 January 1753

Popes Works large 8vo. 2.<sup>d</sup> Edit: 9vs: N<sup>o</sup> 750

Jan: 17. 1753

Shts: Pages Produce Cost of  $14\frac{2}{4}$   $\frac{e}{e}$  Sold at  $33\frac{e}{e}$  Profit

Books

D. <sup>r</sup> Warburton & M. <sup>r</sup> Knappt.	147	7.	570 $\frac{2}{3}$	404:16:4—	941:12:—	536:15:8
Mess. <sup>rs</sup> Tonson & Co.	12	11	49	34:15:2 $\frac{1}{2}$	80:17:—	46: 1:9 $\frac{1}{2}$
M. <sup>r</sup> Lintot	24	10	95 $\frac{1}{3}$	67:12:6 $\frac{1}{2}$	157: 6:—	89:13:5 $\frac{1}{2}$
M. <sup>r</sup> Bathurst	9	—	35	24:16:9	57:15:—	32:18:3
	193	12	750	532:—:10—	1237:10:—	705: 9:2
	—	—	—	—	—	—
						532:—:10
						—
						£1237:10:—
						—

ABSTRACT OF ACCOUNTS: POPE'S WORKS [1751-1754]

BL: Egerton 1959.f.30

## Abstract of Accounts Popes Works 5 Editions

		£.	s.	d.
N <sup>o</sup> 1 Large octavo 9 Vol <sup>s</sup>	Total Profit on 1500	1380:	9:	5
— 2 Crown 1 <sup>st</sup> Edition	—D <sup>o</sup> —3000	1334:	7:	5½
— 3 Large octavo 2 <sup>d</sup> Edition	—D <sup>o</sup> —750	705:	9:	2.
— 4 Crown octavo 2 <sup>d</sup> Edition	—D <sup>o</sup> —2500	986:	15:	..
— 5 Pot octavo 10 Vol <sup>s</sup>	—D <sup>o</sup> —3000	796:	17:	6
		10750	5203	18 6½

D <sup>r</sup> Warburton & M <sup>r</sup> Knaptons share	—Tonson & Co share
in N <sup>o</sup> 1—1050:11:11	in N <sup>o</sup> 1—90: 7: 2
— N <sup>o</sup> 2—1000: 4: 6	— N <sup>o</sup> 2—93:10: 4
— N <sup>o</sup> 3—536:15: 8	— N <sup>o</sup> 3—46: 1: 9½
— N <sup>o</sup> 4—759: 7: 6	— N <sup>o</sup> 4—63:15: ..
— N <sup>o</sup> 5—592: 1: 6 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	— N <sup>o</sup> 5—56:...:11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>
£3939: 1: 1 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	£349:15: 2 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>

M <sup>r</sup> Lintots share	—Mr Bathursts share
N <sup>o</sup> 1—175: 8: 3	N <sup>o</sup> 1—64: 2: 1
N <sup>o</sup> 2—177:13:10½	N <sup>o</sup> 2—62:18: 9
N <sup>o</sup> 3—89:13: 5½	N <sup>o</sup> 3—32:18: 3
N <sup>o</sup> 4—121:.....	N <sup>o</sup> 4—42:12: 6
N <sup>o</sup> 5—107: 8:11	N <sup>o</sup> 5—41: 6: 1
£671: 4: 6	£243:17: 8

		£	s.	d.
—D <sup>r</sup> Warburtons	$\frac{2}{3}$ of 3939:1:1 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	2626:	...	9
—M <sup>r</sup> Knapton	$\frac{1}{3}$	1313:	...	4½
—M <sup>r</sup> Tonson & Co		349:	15:	3
—M <sup>r</sup> Lintot		671:	4:	6
—M <sup>r</sup> Bathurst		243:	17:	8
		£5203:	18:	6½

WARBURTON'S ACCOUNT

18 May 1759

BL: Egerton 1959.f.29

An acct of the profits of Pope while I had 2 3<sup>ds</sup> of  
his work. May 18 1759

Since I made up my acct with Mr Knapton, and his  
 selling his share (which was the 3<sup>d</sup> pt of Pope)  
 to Mess<sup>rs</sup> Tonson & Millar, and my selling to them  
 one 6<sup>th</sup> more, so that my share in Pope is now one  
 half, Mess<sup>rs</sup> Tonson and Millar have printed two Ed.<sup>ns</sup>  
 one in crown 8<sup>o</sup> and another in pot oct.<sup>o</sup> and are now  
 ab<sup>t</sup> to print a third in large oct.<sup>o</sup> which when sold  
 will produce for my share of the clear profits of these  
 three Ed.<sup>ns</sup>

840<sup>1\*</sup>

according to the acc.<sup>ts</sup> in these papers.

Besides the profits of the Ed.<sup>ns</sup> of the Essay on Man  
 which continues selling separately.

\* Although this figure has been inked over, it is  
 still faintly legible.

[Overleaf: the Knapton Account with Bowyer (Maslen 552)]

11

[illegible]

**APPENDIX C**

**WARBURTON'S AND THE KNAPTONS'**

**ACCOUNTS WITH GOSLING'S BANK**



# APPENDIX C: WARBURTON'S AND THE KNAPTONS' BANK ACCOUNTS

A long tumble-down column of folio bank ledgers flanks a dusty basement floor in Barclays Bank (Goslings Branch) at 19 Fleet Street, London.<sup>1</sup> Recorded there are the accounts of most of the leading members of the eighteenth-century book trade.<sup>2</sup> The day to day debits and credits of such leading printers and booksellers as William Bowyer, John Nichols, Samuel Richardson, the Tonsons, the Lintots, and the Rivingtons, as well as other money-savers like Samuel Johnson and Thomas Gainsborough, are tallied up and cross-referenced in immaculate script. With the help of the index, it is easy to find out, for example, that one of Warburton's more respectable critics, the 'Renegado Scholiast' John Upton, had a modest balance of £20 8s. 10d. on 2 January 1748 which dropped to £10 10s. by 3 July 1751.

Given their enormous time-span, intricate calculations, and significant clientele (who came in and signed their accounts from time to time, thereby leaving an invaluable autograph collection), the Gosling ledgers offer a wealth of information to the literary historian. Like all bank accounts, Gosling's ledgers do not necessarily give a complete estimation of the customer's cash-flow; who may be in

<sup>1</sup>For the demise of the possessive apostrophe in such words as Barclay's and Gosling's (which do not appear on that bank's letter-head), see John Ezard's article, 'Apostrophe joins dying species', The Guardian (8 Nov. 1983), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>I am indebted to Dr J.D. Fleeman of Pembroke College, Oxford, for advising me to examine Gosling's ledgers. I am also grateful to Mr K. Roberts, PRO Manager, Barclays Bank, Goslings Branch, 19 Fleet Street, London, for permitting me to make transcriptions of the ledgers.

the red here may be overdrawn elsewhere - at the bookies', the gambling table, the club. When John Knapton died in 1770 there was a balance of £331 10s. 5½d. left in his account, yet he bequeathed about £5000 in his will.<sup>3</sup> But Gosling's ledgers help to give us an overall view of his clients fortunes and supplies some valuable minute particulars.

One of the reasons why Robert (and later his son Francis) Gosling attracted so many accounts from members of the book trade was that he had himself been a bookseller. His name shares the same imprint as John and Paul Knapton on Ephraim Chambers's Cyclopaedia (2nd ed. 1738; 3rd ed. 1739; 4th ed. 1741) and Taylor's The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living (1739). Close proximity to St Paul's Churchyard was another consideration. Gosling's bank on Fleet Street was within a couple of hundred yards of the centre of the London book trade and much handier for carrying sums of money to and fro than, say, Drummond's of Charing Cross. Situated in Ludgate Street, the Knaptons' book-shop would have been about a five minutes' walk to Gosling's bank. The risk of being robbed in transit would have been cut down.

The accounts following, giving an outline of Warburton's and the Knaptons' financial dealings, show whom they transacted business with, when, and what the results were.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Dr J.D. Fleeman has used Gosling's ledgers in his article, 'The revenue of a writer: Samuel Johnson's literary earnings', in Studies in the Book Trade: In honour of Graham Pollard, Oxford Bibliographical Society (Oxford, 1975), pp. 211-30; cf. p. 224, n. 2. My own study must be prefaced with his own warning, 'The following tabular record is... little more than a series of rough guide-posts which may be followed only with caution in any future investigations' (211).

John and Paul Knapton's account with Gosling's Bank which was opened in March 1751 - within three months of the publication of the Warburton edition of Pope's Works - shows that although the booksellers dealt in thousands of pounds in debits and credits, their balance was generally fairly low. Their balance on 13 March 1751 was £255 15s. 3d.; by 21 September 1754 their credits totalling £4474 3s. ½d. and their debits totalling £4395 11s. left a balance of £78 12s. ½d. Such a balance, given the huge sums the Knaptons dealt in, was perilously close to the limit. Gosling, we imagine, from his experience in the book trade, knew what sort of financial fluctuations could force a bookseller out of business. Bankruptcy could happen quite easily and unexpectedly: it struck at least two of Pope's booksellers, Lawton Gilliver and John Wilford. Banks likewise could open up then close down in a short space of time. Bank managers, therefore, would be strict to draw the line; overdrafts were unheard of, and debtors' prisons could house even the most eminent of lexicographers. Still, a certain amount of leeway might be given. When Pope, for example was 'in near 200 ll arrear to my Printer',<sup>4</sup> we assume that John Wright would not have been in danger of losing his shop. Wright could forestall his own creditors until Pope paid his bill.

The Knaptons' account shows the various members of the book trade to whom they owed money and by whom they were

<sup>4</sup>Corr., IV, 350.

paid. In the autumn of 1754, for example, they owed Robert Horsfield a total of £620, while on the credit side they received a lump sum of £274 2s. 5d. from Birt, Sandby, Hitch, Rivington, Cooper, and Baldwin. Within the first six weeks of 1755 the Knaptons owed one of their printers, William Strahan, £68, £38 of which was probably their share of the printing costs of Johnson's Dictionary. An early sign of the Knaptons' financial problems may be detected in this regard: the Knaptons missed their first payment to Strahan for the Dictionary in 1750-51 and had to make it up on 12 June 1752 with a lump sum of £45 12s. They lagged behind again on their £38 instalment on 9 November 1753.<sup>5</sup> (Andrew Millar, we might note, seems to have been prompt in his payments for the printing of the Dictionary.)

The Knaptons also owed money to Warburton for his stock investments and to other members of their family, George and William Knapton. The death of Paul Knapton on 12 June 1755 precipitated the near collapse of the Knapton bookselling business. Two days later some twenty-five members of the book trade paid £475 4s. into the account which was then examined by Gosling. The balance was calculated at £556 8s. ½d. The abstract of accounts (see Appendix B) for the first five editions of Pope's Works indicates that Warburton's share was £2626 9d., and as he mentions helping out Knapton at this time, it is

<sup>5</sup> See J.A. Cochrane, Dr. Johnson's Printer: the life of William Strahan (London, 1964), pp. 26-27.

conceivable that Warburton prevented John Knapton from being declared bankrupt by withholding his own profits. Instead, a trusteeship was formed to administer the Knapton business which comprised of the Longmans, Charles Hitch, Andrew Millar, Robert Dodsley, and Knapton himself. Knapton was forced to sell off most of his stock at an auction held on 25 September 1755 (see Appendix D). And he was also forced to part with the life-blood of any bookseller's existence, his copyrights. The credit side of Knapton's account on 18 October 1755 shows twenty-six deposits. The repeated figures (e.g. £83 6s. 8d. paid in by six booksellers) suggest that these are payments for copyright shares. The capital generated from this Dutch auction brought Knapton's credit up to £1386 13s. 4d. A month later £1600 was withdrawn in £400 sums by Millar, Dodsley, Knapton, and Longman. Thus Knapton was allowed to carry on bookselling in a minor capacity. The trustees' account dwindled to four pence in June 1756. Thereafter, John Knapton slowly built up his capital, so that by 20 March 1760 he had a net balance of £608 14s. 9d.

Knapton held his account with Gosling's bank until death. His demise was noted in the customary way in Gosling's ledger. The three executors, George Knapton, John Part-ridge, and Robert Horsfield, witnessed the final tally: £331 10s. 5½d. In spite of being on the verge of bankruptcy in 1755, John Knapton died a modestly successful bookseller.

....





WARBURTON'S ACCOUNT WITH GOSLING'S BANK

<u>1756</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1756</u>	<u>Creditor</u>	
Jul 2	[Carried over]			710.-9.-2
Aug 30	To a Lw of Atty to sell N.S.S. Anns	3000.---.--	Jul 2 [Carried over]	60.---.--
Sep 1	To Himself	80.---.--	Sep 3 By Bill on Shelvocke	<u>3185.-8.-7</u>
Sep 9	To Do	73.15.-7	Sep 8 By 6 Mo Divd due 5 Jul	90.---.--
Oct 20	To Do	<u>3193.18.-7</u>	1756 on £6000	178.10.---
Nov 15	To Ellen Fothergill	100.---.--	Sep 9 By £200 N.S.S. Anns	30.---.--
	To Himself	90.---.--	By Bill on Shelvocke	<u>3483.18.-7</u>
Dec 16	To £3000 3 Pct 1751 transfd	41.-5.---		<u>3193.18.-7</u>
Dec 23	To A. Millar	2658.15.---		290.---.--
	To 6 Bank Notes sent to him at twice	10.---.--	Nov 13 By Do on Do	2700.---.--
<u>1757</u>		200.---.--	Dec 7 By £100 N.S.S. Anns	88.10.---
Mar 21	To Himself		Dec 16 By Messrs Knaptons Trustees	21.18.-1
Mar 22	To Lw of Atty to sell £3000 3 Pct 1751	60.---.--	Dec 30 By Bill on Shelvocke	100.---.--
		<u>.-3.---</u>	<u>1757</u>	
		<u>3160.-3.---</u>	Jan 1 By Do on Wharton	121.15.---
			Jan 22 By 6 Mo divd due 5 Jan 1757	135.---.--
			Jan 27 By £100 N.S.S. Anns	87.---.--
			Jan 31 By Bill on Lightfoot	20.---.--
				<u>3564.-3.-1</u>

A SUMMARY OF JOHN AND PAUL KNAPTON'S ACCOUNT (GOSLING'S BANK)

<u>1751</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1751</u>	<u>Creditor</u>
Mar 24	£2175.-6.-9	Mar 13	£2431.-2.--
[10 entries]	659.-2.11	Apr 8 [4 entries]	2175.-6.-9
<u>1752</u>			<u>255.15.-3</u>
Aug 3	£3111.-8.--	<u>1752</u>	<u>735.---.-4</u>
Dec 7	1098.-5.-2	Aug 7	£3540.-9.10
<u>1753</u>		Dec 6	1163.11.-8
Apr 21	1461.14.-8	<u>1753</u>	
23 Aug	4072.10.10	Apr 4	2102.12.-3
<u>1754</u>		Aug 10	4212.13.-8
Feb 25	2691.-6.--	<u>1754</u>	
Jun 19	2133.13.10	Feb 23	3104.-9.-1
Sep 25	4395.11.--	Jun 1	2742.-3.-½
		Sep 21	4474.-3.-½
			<u>4395.11.--</u>
		[Balance]	<u>78.12.-½</u>

[THE KNAPTONS' ACCOUNT: 1751-1754]

## JOHN AND PAUL KNAPTON'S ACCOUNT AT GOSLING'S BANK (1754-55)

<u>1754</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1754</u>	<u>Creditor</u>
	[Sample payments include:]		
Oct 7	To H. Woodfall	Sep 28	[Balance brought forward]
Oct 19	To Robt. Horsfield	Oct 1	By no Note
Oct 24	[Total debits]	Oct 4	By Do
Oct 25	To Robt. Horsfield	Oct 22	By Do
Nov 6	To Fras. Stephenson	Oct 31	[Sundrys/Nixon Prentice]
Nov 6	[Total debits]	Nov 2	By no Note
Nov 8	To Robt. Horsfield	Nov 13	By Do
Nov 15	To Robt. Horsfield	Nov 25	By Do
Nov 26	To Geo. Knapton	Dec 2	By Do
Nov 26	[Total debits]	Dec 14	By Do
Nov 26	To Themselves		By Sundry Notes:
Nov 30	To Wm. Knapton		Birt 45.13.-6
Dec 3	To Malachy Postlethwayt		Sandby 20.10.--
Dec 30	To Robt. Horsfield		Hitch 68.-8.--
Dec 30	[Total debits]		Rivington 80.--.-
			Cooper 26.-4.--
			Baldwin 33.-6.11
<u>1755</u>			274.-2.-5
			<u>2654.10.-3½</u>
Jan 18	To Robt. Horsfield	Dec 17	By Do:
Feb 1	To Wm. Strahan		Cox 23.10.--
Feb 1	To Malachy Postlethwayt		Johnston 42.--.-
Feb 8	To Wm Strahan	Dec 31	By Manbys Note
			27.-9.--
		<u>1755</u>	
		Jan 4	By Sundry Notes:
			Whiston 26.10.--
			Brown 28.--.-
			Millar 36.-4.--
			<u>90.14.--</u>

## JOHN AND PAUL KNAPTON'S ACCOUNT AT GOSLING'S BANK (1755)

<u>1755</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1755</u>	<u>Creditor</u>
Feb 13	[Brought over]		
Feb 13	To £200 N.S.S. Anns. tranfd. to Dr. Warburton by Groves Wheeler at 100 5/8 Pct 201.-5.--	3095.14.-1	Jan 8 By no Note 126.---
	Comm. .-5.--		Jan 8 By Bill on Stabler 105.---
Feb 20	To £500 Do tranfd to Revd. Mr. Whishaw	201.10.--	Jan 25 By Do on Sundrys/Ker. Barton 175.---
	[Various debits including:]		Jan 28 By Do on Mony 154.12.16
Mar 24	To Andrew Millar	506.-5.--	Feb 8 By no Note 80.---
			[Carried over]
Mar 26	To Andrew Millar	13.19.--	Feb 14 By Bill on Ellis 3478.15.-9½
Mar 26	To James Bettenham	3999.10.-3	Feb 20 By no Note 60.---
Mar 26	To Wm. Strahan	24.---	Feb 20 By no Note 320.---
Mar 26	To Rd. Reily	20.---	Feb 20 By Do 63.---
Apr 2	To Rd. Nutt	30.---	Feb 28 By Do 100.---
Apr 3	To Wm. Chambers	28.11.-6	Feb 28 By Hodges Note 90.---
Apr 10	To Robt. Horsfield	28.10.--	
Apr 11	To Mr Tipping	75.---	[Balance]
Apr 14	To Robt. Foulis	50.---	Mar 29 By no Note 112.-5.-6½
Apr 15	To Robt. Horsfield	55.---	Mar 29 By Do 200.---
Apr 15	To Wm. Bowyer	20.---	Apr 14 By Do 75.---
		50.---	Apr 19 By Do 128.---
		401.-1.--	Apr 30 By Do 50.---
			Apr 30 By Do 152.10.--
			May 3 By Do 52.10.--
			May 8 By Do 220.---
			May 16 By Do 60.---
			May 23 By Do 200.---
May 17	[Various debits including:]	100.-2.-6	
	To Dr. Warburton for N.S.S.	985.15.-6	May 26 By Bill on Ker 1250.-5.-6½
Jun 9	[Total debits]	1309.19.-6	Jun 9 By Longmans Note 100.---
			40.18.--

JOHN AND PAUL KNAPTON'S ACCOUNT AT GOSLING'S BANK (1755)

<u>1755</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1755</u>	<u>Creditor</u>
Jun 16	To Bal. of their Acct. the		
	14th Instt. to Mr John Knapton		
	Acct.		
		556.-8.-- $\frac{1}{2}$	
			Notes: Ware 15.---
			Brackstone 7.-4.
			Sandby 15.---
			Rivington 78.---
			Durham 15.---
			Payne 15.---
			Chapelle 7.-4.
			Davis 6.---
			Osborne 9.---
			Worrall 15.---
			Barker 15.---
			Lownds 15.---
			Withers 15.---
			Frye 15.---
			Reeve 15.---
			Millar 15.---
			Hitch 68.-8.
			Field 15.---
			Crowder 15.---
			Davey 30.---
			Dod 30.---
			Clarke 7.-4.
			Comyns 7.-4.
			Ballard 15.---
			Beecroft 15.---
			475.-4.---
			Then this Accompt between Me
			& Gosling was Examined, Adjusted 1866.-7.-6 $\frac{1}{2}$
			& Agreed to, the Balance due from 1309.19.-6
			them being Five Hundred & fifty six
			Pounds 8-- $\frac{1}{2}$ which is carried to my 556.-8.-- $\frac{1}{2}$
			Credit—

[Paul Knapton died on 12 June 1755  
(Gentleman's Magazine, XXV, 284).]





MESSRS J. & P. KNAPTON, T. & T. LONGMAN, C. HITCH, A. MILLAR, & R. DODSLEY (TRUSTEES' ACCOUNT, 1755)

<u>1755</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1755</u>	<u>Creditor</u>	
Nov 15	To Andrew Millar			20.---
Nov 15	To Robert Dodsley	400.---		40.---
Nov 15	To John Knapton	400.---		20.---
Nov 18	To Thos. Longman	400.---		<u>80.---</u>
		<u>1600.---</u>		43.-6.-8
[Part of John Knapton's stock in				
quires and copies was auctioned				
off on 25 September 1755.]				
		Oct 10	By no Note	
		Oct 18	By Sundry Notes: Ware	83.-6.-8
			Davey	83.-6.-8
			Innys	83.-6.-8
			Dod	83.-6.-8
			Osborne	83.-6.-8
			Uriel	20.---
			Clark	20.---
			Hitch	100.---
			Rivington	83.-6.-8
			Withers	20.---
			Reeve	20.---
			Sandby	33.-6.-8
			Worral	20.---
			Nourse	33.-6.-8
			Davis	20.---
			Jackson	33.-6.-8
			Payne	33.-6.-8
			Wilson	33.-6.-8
			Wren	33.-6.-8
			Vaillant	66.13.-4
			Brackstone	100.---
			Baker	66.13.-4
			Browne	33.-6.-8
			Whiston	33.-6.-8
			Baldwin	66.13.-4
			Crowder	100.---
				<u>1386.13.-4</u>

MESSRS J. & P. KNAPTON, T. & T. LONGMAN, C. HITCH, A. MILLAR, & R. DODSLEY (TRUSTEES' ACCOUNT, 1755)

<u>1755</u>	<u>Creditor</u>	
Oct 18	[Brought forward]	1386.13.-4
Oct 20	By Keiths Note	33.-6.-8
Oct 20	By Bill on Thornton	40.---
Oct 21	By Shuckburghs Note	66.13.-4
Oct 21	By Tonsons Do	20.---
Oct 21	By Paynes Do	33.-6.-8
Oct 22	By Woodyers Do	20.---
Oct 23	By Bathursts Do	50.---
		<u>1773.-6.-8</u>
Oct 24	By Hodges Do	83.-6.-8
Oct 24	By Bill on Portis	56.14.---
Oct 25	By Owens Note	33.-6.-8
Oct 25	By Strahans Do	20.---
Oct 28	By Coopers Do	100.---
Oct 28	By Coxes Do	20.---
Oct 29	By Wards Do	33.-6.-8
Oct 30	By Part of Manbys Do	40.---
Oct 30	By Kincaid & Donaldsons no Note	60.---
Nov 1	By Sundry Notes	120.---
Nov 5	On Stonehouses Note	20.---
Nov 6	On full of Manbys Note	26.13.-4
Nov 14	By John Smiths no Note	28.-7.---
Nov 15	By Hawkins Note	33.-6.-8
Nov 19	By Bridleys Do	50.---
		<u>2498.-7.-8</u>

MESSRS J. & P. KNAPTON, T. & T. LONGMAN, C. HITCH, A. MILLAR, & R. DODSLEY (TRUSTEES' ACCOUNT, 1755-57)

<u>1755</u>	<u>Debtor</u>		<u>1755</u>	<u>Creditor</u>	
Dec 4	[Brought forward] To Chs. Hitch	1600.---.--- 500.---.---	Dec 8	[Brought forward] By Linds Note	2498.-7.-8 33.-6.-8
<u>1756</u>			<u>1756</u>		
Mar 16	To Hitches Note transfd.	125.---.---	Jan 3	By no Note	12.12.---
Jun 5	To Andrew Millar	2225.---.---	Jan 5	By Bill on Sundrys/Yule	70.14.-8
Jun 11	To John Knapton	199.-7.---	Jan 17	By Do on Hitch	100.---.---
Jun 15	To Chs. Hitch	366.---.-4	Jan 28	By Do on Chapelle	33.-6.-8
Jun 17	To Thomas Longman	572.13.-8	Jan 31	By Do on Brotherton	20.---.---
Jun 30	To Messrs Dodsley	432.13.-8 196.---.-4 <u>1766.15.---</u>	Feb 9	By Do on Johnston	100.---.---
<u>1757</u>			Feb 14	By Do on Hitch	125.---.---
Mar 23	To John Knapton	.---.-4	Feb 17	By Do on Sundrys: Hitch Rivington Dod Davey Ware Richardson	<u>2993.-7.-8</u> <u>2225.---.---</u>   

A SUMMARY OF JOHN KNAPTON'S ACCOUNT WITH GOSLING'S BANK (1758-1760)

<u>1758</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1758</u>	<u>Creditor</u>
Feb 9	479.16.--	Feb 4	863.-7.-9 479.16.--
Sep 12	379.12.-6	Jun 16	383. 622.-3.-9 379.12.-6
<u>1759</u>		<u>1759</u>	242.11.-3
Mar 9	276.16.--	Feb 14	357.14.-9 276.16.--
Jul 19 Aug 27	1369.--.10 1527.15.-9	Mar 24	80.18.-9 2144.-1.-7 1527.15.-9
Dec 27	503.15.--	Sep 7	616.-5.10 1277.17.-4 503.15.--
<u>1760</u>		<u>1760</u>	774.-2.-4
Mar 6	712.16.-2		1321.10.11 712.16.-2
		Mar 20	608.14.-9

A SUMMARY OF JOHN KNAPTON'S ACCOUNT WITH GOSLING'S BANK (1760-1770)

<u>1760</u>	<u>Debtor</u>	<u>1760</u>	<u>Creditor</u>
Jul 29	1616.12.--	Jul 29	2073.-4.-5½
Sep 18	2108.13.--	Sep 24	2839.-5.10½
	<u>2158.13.--</u>		<u>2158.13.--</u>
		[Balance]	<u>680.12.10½</u>
<u>1761</u>		<u>1761</u>	
Jan 9	554.15.--	Jan 19	1165.12.10½
Jun 10	448.--.-2	[Balance]	<u>610.17.10½</u>
		May 14	684.19.--½
Sep 23	721.10.-8	Sep 26	1330.-3.--½
			<u>721.10.-8</u>
Mar 22	1214.16.-6	[Balance]	<u>608.12.-4½</u>
		Mar 23	1917.-1.-5½
			<u>1214.16.-6</u>
		[Balance]	<u>702.-4.11½</u>
		<u>1763</u>	
		Sep 20 [Balance]	496.-1.-7½
		<u>1770</u>	
		May 22 [Balance]	331.10.-5½

[John Knapton died in 1770, possibly a few days before May 22. His executors, George Knapton, John Partridge, and Robert Horsfield, placed their signatures in Gosling's ledger on 4 October 1770.]

**APPENDIX D**

**THE KNAPTON AUCTION RECORDS**



#### Appendix D: Knapton's Auction

The following records speak largely for themselves. John Knapton was forced to put his livelihood under the hammer in order to settle his debts with Warburton (possibly as high as £2626 9d. for the five Pope editions alone<sup>1</sup>) and William Bowyer (which rose to £1470 6s. just before Paul Knapton's death in 1755). I leave it to some more mathematically minded scholar to decipher the amounts in the margins and compute the profits generated from the sale. The ultimate purpose of the auction - to pay off his creditors - was eventually accomplished: Bowyer's printing ledgers show a substantial payment of over £750 on 3 June 1756 (although a full settlement took three years)<sup>2</sup> and Warburton's account at Gosling's Bank reveals a lump sum of £1581 10s. 5d. by Knapton's trustees a week later.<sup>3</sup> The delay in payment after the auction may have resulted from the terms of credit (e.g. six months for £20 and up to thirty-six months for a £300 purchase).

The 'Catalogue of Books in Quires, and Copies' which itemizes the stock (or rather 'part' of Knapton's stock) and copyrights sold on 25 September 1755 gives us an idea

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix B. Warburton would also have been owed money for the separate editions of the Essay on Man.

<sup>2</sup>For the figures on Knapton's debt in Bowyer's ledgers I am indebted to Keith Maslen for supplying details.

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix C.

of the sheer bulk of printed quires which accumulated over the years. Storage costs were a consideration, as Dr Johnson pointed out.<sup>4</sup> Knapton's stock would have to be kept in a clean, dry warehouse, well away from pipe-smokers, fire-places, chimneys and such. And, of course, the printers of the hundreds of titles eventually had to be paid.

To consider the first item alone on the catalogue: '178 Ainsworth's Dictionary, 4to.' The sheets for a single quarto volume of this work measure roughly  $8\frac{1}{2}$  x  $10\frac{1}{2}$ " and are about two inches in thickness. This item on its own would yield a column almost thirty feet high. (One assumes the Queen's-Head tavern was chosen as the venue for its close proximity to the warehouse as well as its ample square-footage.) The combination of mountains of stock and sluggish circulation must have been a potent factor in the near-collapse of the Knapton business.

Not all the items listed carried the Knapton imprint. The Knaptons obviously bought and sold quires as wholesalers (dealing with other members of the trade) and as retailers (with ordinary book-buyers). Knapton carried, for example, 40 four-volume sets of Fielding's Amelia

<sup>4</sup>Boswell's Life of Johnson, edited by George Birkbeck Hill, revised by L.F. Powell, 6 vols (Oxford, 1950), II, 424-26 (Letter to Dr Wetherell, 12 March 1776). In the mark-up from Cadell (the London bookseller) to a country book-buyer (Cadell makes 14s.; the buyer pays 20s.), Dr Johnson reckoned Cadell was charging 1s. for storage costs (p. 426).

which had been published by Andrew Millar.

One of the prized copyrights Knapton was forced to give up was that of Anson's Voyages which was originally published in 1745 by R. Walker. It came under the Knapton imprint in the second edition. Warburton placed an order for two copies in Ralph Allen's name on 11 May 1748 to be sent 'bound & gilt' by Leake's parcel. Buyers of the octavo edition could obtain quarto plates of the maps at Knaptons' shop. As the following records show, Charles Hitch picked up 72 large paper quarto volumes at 15s 6d. each - a total of £55 16s. The copyrights for quarto and octavo editions were sold in one-eighth shares to Bathurst, Hodges, Ward, Osborne, Wilson, Crowder, Cox and Browne. Their bids range from £38 to £42, yielding a total of £318. In the following year six of the above names appear on the quarto edition of Anson's Voyages (along with four new names, including Bowyer and Strahan). By far the most profitable copyright, that of Rapin's History, fetched a total of £1190. My mathematically minded scholar has, now, turned up and informs me (after much magnification and pocket-calculating) that the grand total for the copyrights is: £4,642 11s. 9d. This was indeed more than enough to pay off Bowyer and Warburton, although John Knapton abdicated from his position of authority in the London book trade.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> I am grateful Dr J.A. Edwards of the University of Reading library for forwarding photocopies of the enclosed trade sale catalogues. To Tom Bell I owe the tallying up. This figure is quite high in comparison with other trade sales in Terry Belanger's thesis, 'Booksellers' Sales of Copyright: aspects of the London Book Trade, 1718-1768', Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 1970, although the Tonson sale of 1767 realized almost twice that of the Knapton sale.

# CATALOGUE

O F

BOOKS in QUIRES, and COPIES,

Part of the STOCK of Mr JOHN KNAPTON,

To be SOLD at the

QUEEN'S-HEAD Tavern, in PATER-NOSTER-ROW,  
on Thursday, September 25, 1755.

Three Months Credit for Ten Pounds; Six Months for Twenty Pounds; Two Six Months for One Hundred Pounds; Three Six Months for One Hundred and Fifty Pounds; and Four Six Months for Two Hundred Pounds; or for any Sum above Three Hundred Pounds, Six Six Months, signing Notes dated from the Sixteenth Day after the Delivery.

Any Purchaser may discount his own Notes at the Rate of Five per Cent. per Annum.

The Numbers of several Books will be put up in Lots, or together, as the Company choose. No Books to be made perfect, unless the Imperfections are demanded in Fourteen Days after Delivery.

The Sale will begin punctually at 12 o'Clock, and Dinner will be on the Table at Two.

20	1	2	173	A	Insworth's Dictionary, 4to.	90	Bladen's Caesar, 8vo. 7/5 - 2/6	2	1	Shelton
20	1	2	50		Ditto Folio.	20	Bengelii Testamentum Græcum Oxoniæ.	1	4	Baldwin
15	6	72			Anson's Voyage, 4to. Large Paper.	66	Burkit on the New Testament, Folio.	14		Millar
3	6	240			Ditto 8vo.	8	Biographia Britannica, 3 vols. Folio.	1	3	Livington
15	0	10			Albinus's Anatomical Tables, and System of the Blood-Vessels and Nerves, Folio, with Explanations, 4to.	200	Boyer's Grammar.	1	1	2. 10. 2. Miller
11	16	10			Ditto with Explanations, Folio.	6	Bacon's Works, 3 vols. Folio.	2	2	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
1	0	3			Atlas Mariimus, Folio.	4	Barlow's Justice.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
1	0	3			General, Folio.	217	Dr Clarke's Works, 4 vols. Folio.	2	2	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
1	4	40			Amelia, 4 vols. 1/5 - 2/5	36	Ditto Large Paper.	2	2	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
5	0	17			Abernethy's Posthumous Works, Vol. 1st, and 4th.	246	Ditto Vol. 3d and 4th, Folio.	1	10	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	3	1			Bedford's Chronology, Folio.	40	18 Sermons, 8vo.	1	2	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	2			Beveridge's Chronology, Lat. 8vo.	988	Sermons, 11 vols. Eighteens.	1	8	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Bishop Butler's Sermons, 8vo.	297	Sermons on the Attributes, 8vo.	1	2	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
20	7	3			Analogy, 8vo. 7/5 - 2/6	160	Paraphrase on the Evangelists, 3 vols. 8vo.	1	5	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
20	7	3			Boyer's French Dictionary, 8vo. 1/5 - 2/6	150	on the Trinity, 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Ditto in Quarto.	360	Letters to Dodwell, 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Burnet on the Articles, Folio.	710	On the Ch. Catechism, 12mo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Bowen's Compleat Atlas, Folio.	900	Essays, 12mo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Bennet on the Common Prayer, 8vo.	380	Homer, 4 vols. 4to. Ill. & Od.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Beveridge's Thoughts, 2 vols. 8vo.	750	Ditto Illiad, 2 vols. 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Ditto in 12mo.	280	Grotius.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Boyle's Lecture Sermons, 3 vols. Folio.	175	Dr John Clarke's Sermons at Boyle's Lectures, 2 vols. 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Blad's Military Discipline, 8vo.	240	Rohault's Physics, 2 vols. 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Bates's Works, Folio.	760	Demonstrations of Sir Isaac Newton's Principles of Philosophy, 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Bentley's Terence, 4to.	280	Cudworth's Morality, 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Ditto Large Paper.	50	Cruden's Concordance, 4to.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Blackmore of the Dropfy.	4	Calmet's Dictionary, 3 vols. Folio.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			British Compendium, 3 vols.	200	Calamy's Sermons, 8vo.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3			Bailey's Dictionary, 8vo.	16	Chambers's Dictionary, 2 vols. Folio.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller
10	7	3				44	Supplement, 2 vols. Folio.	1	1	6. 9. 2. 10. 2. Miller

10 Butlers Analogy at Dancy at 2.6

Dancy to have 25 Paraphrases of Grotius at 1.1

1 Rapin 15 Vols 8vo. at 2.5.0 from Dancy

2 Van der Veen 11 Vols from Dancy at 2.0.6

80 Clare on Fluids, 8vo.  
50 Chillingworth's Works, Folio.  
500 Bp Chandler's Defence of Christianity,  
    &c. 3 vols. 8vo.  
20 Collins's Supplement to the Peerage, 2  
    vols. 8vo.  
15 Camden's Britannia, 2 vols. Folio.  
350 Clergyman's Companion, 8vo.  
100 Ciceronis Orationes Delph. 8vo.  
78 Cicero per Davis, Cantab. 6 vols. 8vo.  
40 — de Natura Deorum, per Davis,  
    8vo.  
360 — de Finibus, 8vo.  
150 — de Divinatione, 8vo.  
300 — Academica, 8vo.  
500 Common-Prayer best Companion, 8vo.  
160 Cantemir's (Prince) Othman Hist. Folio.  
150 Cellarius's 33 Maps of Ant. Geography.  
550 Geographia Antiqua, suited to Cellarius's  
    Maps, 4to.  
5 Collier's Supplement, Folio.  
43 Chefs made easy, 12mo.  
24 Crouche's Rates, Vol. I.  
660 Crevier's Lives of Roman Emperors, Vol.  
    1st, 2d, and 3d.  
    N. B. The 4th, 5th, and 6th Volumes are print-  
    ed, and the Purchaser of Vol. 1st, 2d, and 3d,  
    is to have them, paying the Expence of Paper  
    and Print.  
100 Coles's Dictionary, 8vo.  
22 Congreve's Works, 3 vols. 12mo.  
9 Card, 2 Vols. 12mo.  
450 Ditton of Fluxions, 8vo.  
720 Dougharty's Gauging, 12mo.  
70 Description of Holland, 8vo.  
12 David Simple's Letters, 2 vols. 12mo.  
664 Devil of a Wife, 12mo.  
17 Dennis's Fables, 8vo.  
676 England's Gazetteer, 3 vols. 12mo.  
250 Echar'd's Gazetteer, 12mo.  
60 Edon's Thesaurus, 4to.  
50 Fleetwood's Relative Duties, 8vo.  
100 Ford de 39 Articulis Ecclesiae Ang. 8vo.  
18 Fiddes's Life of Cardinal Wolfey, Folio.  
96 Fleetwood's Works, Folio.  
17 Franklin's Phalaris.  
34 Fielding's Journal, 12mo.  
13 Fuller's Family Dispensatory, 8vo.  
6 Foster's Discourses, 2 vols. 4to.  
34 Gay's Fables, Vol. 2d. 4to. Fine Paper.  
150 Gibbs's Rules for Drawing, Folio.  
56 — Designs of Architecture, Folio.  
126 Garretson's Exercices, 12mo.  
50 Gay's Fables, Vol. 1st. 8vo.  
250 Ditto, Vol. 2d. 8vo.  
120 Gordon's Grammar, 8vo.  
90 Gentleman Instructed, 2 vols. 12mo.  
18 Garth's Ovid, 2 vols. 12mo.  
20 Grey's Remarks on Shakespear, 2 vols.  
23 Gil Blas, 4 vols. Eighteens.  
10 Houbraken's Heads of Illustrious Persons,  
    with Birch's Lives, 2 vols. Folio, Im-  
    perial Paper.  
100 Ditto 2 vols. Folio, Small Paper.  
80 Howell's Medulla Historiae Anglicanae,  
    8vo.  
160 Hawney's Measurer, 12mo.  
325 Hales of Eaton's Tracts, 12mo.  
276 History of Charles XII. 3 vols. 8vo.  
22 Henry on the Bible, 5 vols. Folio.  
16 Heath's Account of Scilly, 8vo.  
25 Hawney's Trigonometry, 8vo.  
48 Howell's Hist. of the Bible, 3 vols. 8vo.  
25 Horace Delphini, 8vo.  
3 Harris's Lexicon, 2 vols. Folio.  
18 Heister's Anatomy, 8vo.

16 Hatton's Comen.  
75 Howell's Letters.  
156 Hedericus's Lexicon.  
21 Hervey's Meditations, 2 vols. large 8vo.  
36 Hudibras, Eighteens.  
750 History of China, 8vo.  
50 Juvenal Delphini.  
590 Jackson on the Lord's Prayer, 12mo.  
100 Jenkins on the Christ. Relig. 2 vols. 8vo.  
70 Jamefon on the Pentateuch, Folio.  
19 Keil on the Animal Economy, 8vo.  
4 Kettlewell's Works, 2 vols. Folio.  
128 Kennet on the Creed.  
50 —'s Antiquities.  
120 Laurence's Surveying, 12mo.  
104 Littleton's Dictionary, 4to.  
40 L'Estrange's Aesop, 2 vols. 8vo.  
60 Ditto Vol. 2d.  
22 Littlebury's Herodotus, 2 vols. 8vo.  
44 Lowthorp and Jones's Abridg. 5 vols. 4to.  
19 Leng's Sermons, 8vo.  
34 Laurence's Christian Morals, 8vo.  
50 — Christian Prudence, 8vo.  
8 Lowth's Commentary, Folio.  
18 L'Estrange's Josephus, Folio.  
300 Life of Prideaux, 8vo.  
24 Langham's Duties, 12mo.  
7 Life of Bolingbroke, large 8vo.  
20 Ditto, small 8vo.  
58 Leusden's Compendium.  
12 Miscellanea Curiosa, 3 vols. 8vo.  
184 Marshall on Daniel's Works, 8vo.  
225 Military Memoirs of Marshal Turenne,  
    &c. 8vo.  
30 Mortoux's Don Quixote, Eighteens.  
470 Manners of the Romans, 8vo.  
24 Montfaucon's Regal Antiquities of France,  
    with 300 Copper Plates, 2 vols. Folio.  
240 Mihles's Surgery, 8vo. *1.6 from*  
103 Methodists Compared, 2 vols. 8vo.  
100 — 2d volume.  
300 — 2 vols. 12mo. *11.0 Blottp*  
58 Miller's Kalendar, 8vo. *2.5*  
8 Ogle's Chaucer, 3 vols. 8vo. *2.9 Medwind*  
29 Ovid's Epistles, 12mo. *1.8 When*  
40 — Art of Love, 12mo. *1.8 When*  
5 Puffendorf's Law of Nature, Folio. *1.2.0*  
84 Pearson on the Creed, Folio. *4.9 Livingtop*  
45 Potter's Antiquities, 2 vols. 8vo.  
450 Pope's Poemata Italorum, 2 vols. *10.0 15.0*  
100 Patrick's Christian Sacrifice, 12mo.  
40 Plato's Works, 2 vols. 12mo. *2.3.0 When*  
25 Puffendorf's Introduction, 2 vols. 8vo. *6.0 Livingston*  
80 Pyle on the Epistles, 2 vols. 8vo. *1.6 2.0*  
18 Persian Tales, 3 vols. 12mo. *4.6 6.0*  
33 Patrick's Commentary, 2 vols. Folio. *13.0 14.0*  
15 Plutarch's Lives, 9 vols. Eighteens. *8.6 10.0*  
46 Rapin's Hist. of England, with the Heads  
    and Monuments, 2 vols. Folio. *1.18.0 2.0*  
54 Ditto Cuts to be work'd off: *1.10.0 Miller 1.0*  
58 Rapin's Hist. of England, with the Heads  
    and Monuments, 15 vols. 8vo. *2.5.0 2.20 9mo*  
28 — Continuation, 2 vols. Folio. *2.2.0*  
264 — Abridgment, 3 vols. 8vo. *7.6*  
280 Richardson's Remarks on Milton, 8vo.  
105 Religion of Nature, 8vo. *10 3.1*  
1390 Rollin's Ancient Hist. 12 vols. Eighteens. *20 3.6.0*  
570 Ditto, 10 vols. 8vo. *4 1.6.0*  
33 — Roman Hist. 16 vols. 8vo. *2 2.8.0 12.0*  
110 — Arts and Sciences, 4 vols. 8vo. *5 12.0*  
400 Revenues of the Romans, 8vo.  
23 Rowe's Lucan, 2 vols. 12mo. *2 1.12.0*  
91 System of Geography, 2 vols. Folio. *2 1.12.0*  
290 Stephens's Sermons against Popery, 8vo.  
350 Salmon's Gazetteer, 12mo. *20 2.*

*2.0 1.0 1.0 1.0*  
*2.0 1.0 1.0 1.0*  
*1.2.6 1.0 1.0 1.0*



160	Sharp's Sermons, 7 vols. 8vo.	21
160	Sharp's Sermons, 7 vols. 12mo.	16
180	Sherlock on Death, 8vo.	1
70	on Judgment, 8vo.	1
40	Stanhope's Kempis, 8vo.	1
50	Sprat's Hist. of the Royal Society, 4to.	1
60	Schrevelii Lexicon, 8vo.	1
168	Bp Smallbrooke against Woolston, 2 vols. 8vo. and 82 2d Volume.	1
2	Spencer de Legibus, 2 vols. Folio.	1
120	Stanhope's Directory.	1
3	Shaw's Bacon, 3 vols. 4to.	1
80	Sandby's Horace, 2 vols. small 8vo.	1
105	Virgil, Royal Paper, 2 vols. 8vo.	1
300	Ditto, small 8vo.	1
180	Terence, Royal Paper, 2 vols. 8vo.	1
240	Ditto, 2 vols. small 8vo.	1
230	Spectators, 8 vols. 12mo.	1
225	Ditto, 18 vols. Eighteens.	1
259	Swift's Works, 12 vols. large 8vo.	1
6	Ditto, 6 vols. in 4to.	1
1430	Ditto, 14 vols. Eighteens.	1
104	Salmon's Modern Hist. Folio.	1
12	Skelton's Discourses, 2 vols. 8vo.	1
15	Shakespeare Illustrated, 2 vols. 12mo.	1
24	Turkish Spy, 8 vols.	1
146	Taylor's Life of Christ, Folio.	1
35	Tracts against Popery, 3 vols. Folio.	1
40	Ditto, Vol. 1st. & 2d. Folio.	1
4	Thompson's Works, 4 vols. 12mo.	1
3	Seasons, large 12mo.	1
3	small 12mo.	1
40	Tournefort's Voyages, 3 vols. 8vo.	1

34	Tillemont's Sermons, 3 vols. Folio.	1	1. 17. 0
60	Sermons, 12 vols. Eighteens.	10	10
31	Life, 8vo.	5	2. 9
9	Sermons, 8vo. Vol. 1st, 2d, 3d, & 4th.		
30	Tales, 4 vols. Eighteens.	6	3. 4
274	Talks of Transubstantiation.	1	1. 11. 6
233	Frequent Communion.	3	
70	Sentiments of Popery, 8vo.		
8	Temple's Works, 2 vols. Folio.	2	1. 0. 0
120	Tales, 4 vols. 12mo.	10	8. 6
12	Tom Jones, 4 vols. 12mo.	4	7. 0
50	Van Swieten's Boerhaave, 11 vols. 8vo.	1	1. 19. 0
100	Vol. 9th, 10th, and 11th.	10	8. 6
150	Venus's Sweden, 8vo.	10	1. 5
60	Virginius Delph, 8vo.	10	3. 10
47	Venus's Portugal.	3	3. 10
180	Wells's Geography of the Old and New Testament, 4 vols. 8vo.	4	6. 0
35	Warburton's Shakespear, 8 vols. 8vo.	1	1. 7. 0
50	Wingate's Arithmetick, 8vo.	10	2. 1. 2
10	Wells's Paraphrase on the New Testament, 2 vols. 4to.	1	1. 12. 0
32	Paraphrase on the Old Testament, 4 vols. 4to.		
200	Word of God the best Guide.	3	3. 10
35	Whiston's Taccot, Lat. 8vo.	2	5. 0
5	Wells's Fables, 4to.	6	6. 0
10	Woods's Institutes, Folio.	1	17. 6. 0
216	Wildair Sir Harry.	13	8. 1. 0
2	Watts's Works, 6 vols. 4to.	1	2. 7. 6

C O P I E S .

Half a Guinea Earnest to be paid for each Lot.

Those mark'd \* are out of print or re-printing.

Whatever Money is advanced upon any Books reviving or re-printing to be repaid by the Purchaser over and above the Purchase Money of the Copy.

Lot.		Lot.			
1	ANSON's Voyage, 4to. and 8vo. with all the Copper-Plates	one 8th.	24	Ditto	one 8th.
2	Ditto	one 8th.	25	Ditto	one 8th.
3	Ditto	one 8th.	26	Biographia Britannica, Folio.	one 17th.
4	Ditto	one 8th.	27	Brinley, Scotch, and Irish Compendium.	one 12th.
5	Ditto	one 8th.	28	Ditto	one 12th.
6	Ditto	one 8th.		N. B. The Irish is ready to be delivered.	
7	Ditto	one 8th.	29	Bayle's Dictionary, 5 vols. Folio.	one 15th and 54th.
8	Ditto	one 8th.	30	Bailey's Dictionary, 8vo.	one 40th.
9	Ainsworth's Dictionary, Folio and 4to.	one 20th.	31	Ditto	one 40th.
10	Ditto	one 20th.	32	Ditto	one 40th.
11	Boyer's Dictionary, French and English, 8vo.	one 40th.	33	Ditto	one 40th.
12	Ditto	one 40th.	34	Burkitt on the New Test. Folio.	one 36th.
13	Ditto	one 10th of a 40th.	35	Ditto	one 40th.
14	Boyer's Dict. French & English, in 4to.	one 20th.	36	Bland's Military Discipline, 8vo.	one 6th.
15	Ditto	one 20th.	37	Ditto	one 6th.
16	Ditto	one 40th.	38	Beveridge's Thoughts, 8vo. and 12mo.	one 10th.
17	Ditto	one 60th.	39	Ditto	one 10th.
18	Ditto	one 10th of a 40th.	40	Beveridge on Prayer, 8vo. & 12mo.	one 10th.
19	Boyer's French Grammar	one 20th.	41	Ditto	one 10th.
20	Bladen's Caesar, 8vo.	one 12th.	42	Common Prayer best Companion, 8vo. the whole.	17. 5. 0
21	Ditto	one 12th.	43	Chitwood's Copies	one ninth.
22	Barlow's Justice, Folio.	one 8th.	44	Cole's Latin and English Dictionary, 8vo. 100 in 8000.	17. 10. 0
23	Ditto	one 8th.			

13: 10: 0 2. 10. 6  
 26 - 0. 0  
 7. 0. 0  
 7. 0. 0  
 10  
 17. 10. 0  
 80 0: 0



Loc.	Loc.
18.0.0 Osborne	45 Cole's Latin and English Dictionary, 8vo. 100 in 8000.
11.11.0 Robinson	46 Ditto — — — — — 66 in 8000
8.10.0 Gooder	47 Cicero's Orat. Delph. 8vo. one 15th.
9.15.0 Hedges	48 Ditto — — — — — one 15th.
4.0.0 Hedges	49 Ditto — — — — — 41 in 2000.
55.0.0 Gooder	50 Chambers's Dictionary and Supplement, 4 vols. — — — — — one 64th.
51.10.0 Bayton	51 Ditto — — — — — one 64th.
51.0.0 Bayton	52 Ditto — — — — — one 64th.
52.10.0 Bayton	53 Ditto — — — — — one 64th.
	54 Cooke's Reports, 7 vols. 8vo. one 16th.
	55 Ditto — — — — — one 16th.
	56 Cheyne's Diseases of Body and Mind, 8vo. one half.
36.0.0 Miller	57 Clarke's Sermons, in 10 vols. 8vo. one 8th.
56.0.0 Miller	58 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
65.0.0 Miller	59 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
84.0.0 Miller	60 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
65.0.0 Miller	61 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
67.0.0 Miller	62 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
70.0.0 Miller	63 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
76.0.0 Miller	64 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	65 Clarke on the Attributes, 8vo. one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	66 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	67 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	68 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	69 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	70 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	71 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
8.0.0 Jones	72 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	73 Clarke's 18 Sermons, 8vo. one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	74 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	75 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	76 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	77 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	78 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	79 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	80 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	81 Clarke's Paraphrase, 2 vols. 8vo. one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	82 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	83 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	84 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	85 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	86 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	87 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	88 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
5.12.6 Miller	89 Clarke's 3 Essays, 12mo. & 8vo. half.
5.12.6 Miller	90 Ditto — — — — — half.
5.12.6 Miller	91 Clarke one the Catechism, 12mo. half.
5.12.6 Miller	92 Ditto — — — — — half.
5.12.6 Miller	93 Clarke's Letters to Dodwell.
	— Leibnitz's Papers.
	— Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.
	— Letter to Dr Wells.
	— Reply to Mr Nelson.
	— Observations on Waterland's second Defence.
	— Modest Plea continued.
	— Letter to R. M.
	— Letter to the Author of true Scripture Doctrine.
	— 3 Letters, with the Doctor's Answers.
	— Apology for Dr Clarke.
	— Letter to Mr B. Hoadly the whole.
2.15.0 Livingston	94 Clarke's Grotius, English, 8vo. — half.
2.15.0 Livingston	95 Ditto — — — — — half.
25.0.0 Bayton	96 Clarke Homer's Ilias, 2 vols. 4to. & 8vo. one 8th.
21.0.0 Livingston	97 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
12.0.0 Bayton	98 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
21.0.0 Bayton	99 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
1.0.0 Bayton	100 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	101 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	102 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	103 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	104 Clarke Homer's Odysses, 2 vols. 4to. & 8vo. — one 8th.
	105 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	106 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	107 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	108 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	109 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	110 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	111 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	112 Clergyman's Companion, 8vo. one 10th.
	113 Ditto — — — — — one 10th.
	114 Collins's Peerage — — — — — one 12th.
	115 Ditto — — — — — one 12th.
	116 Clare on Fluids, 8vo. — one 10th.
	117 Dampier's Voyages, 4 vols. 8vo. with all the Cuts — one 4th.
	118 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.
	119 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.
	120 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.
	121 Dougharty's Gauging, 12mo. — one 4th.
	122 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.
	123 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.
	124 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.
	125 Echard's Gazetteer, Part I. — one 8th.
	— Ditto Part II. — one 6th.
	126 Ditto Part I. — one 9th.
	— Ditto Part II. — one 36th.
	127 Echard's Terence — — — — — one 21st.
	128 Farquhar's Plays, Sir Harry Wildair, the whole. — one 3d.
	129 Ekton's Thesaurus, 4to. — one 9th.
	130 Garretson's Exercise, 12mo. — one 32d.
	131 Gordon's Grammar, 8vo. — one 24th.
	132 Grotius on War and Peace, folio. — one 8th.
	133 Gay's Fables, 2d Vol. — one 4th.
	134 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.
	135 Gibbs's Rules for Drawing, with the Plates — one 6th.
	136 Ditto — — — — — one 6th.
	137 Gibbs's Architecture — — — — — one 6th.
	138 Ditto — — — — — one 6th.
	139 Geographia Classica, 29 Maps — one half.
	140 Ditto — — — — — one half.
	141 Hill's Arithmetic, 8vo. 120 in 2100.
	142 Horseman's Conveyancing, 3 vols folio. — one 8th.
	143 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	144 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	145 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	146 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	147 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	148 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	149 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	150 Horace Delphini, 8vo. — one 18th.
	151 Jacob's Law Dictionary, folio — one 40th.
	152 Ditto — — — — — one 40th.
	153 Ditto — — — — — one 40th.
	154 Ditto — — — — — one 40th.
	155 Hutcheson on the Passions, 8vo. one 8th.
	156 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.
	157 Hudibras, 12mo. and 18mo. 60 in 4000.
	158 Hatton's Comes Commercii — one 56th.
	159 Ditto — — — — — one 40th.
	160 Hederici Lexicon, Greek and Latin, 4to. 125 in 3000.
	161 Ditto — — — — — 125 in 3000.
	162 Ditto — — — — — 125 in 3000.
	163 Keay's Measuring — — — — — one 8th.
	164 Kennet's Antiquities, 8vo. — one 24th.
	165 Lawrence's Surveying, 12mo. the whole. — one 3d.
	— Land Steward, 8vo. — one 12th.
	166 Leusden's Compendium — — — — — one 12th.

51-10.0  
 18.5.0  
 5.15.0  
 23.10.0  
 179.0  
 179.5

[ 5 ]

<i>4.10.0 Bridges</i>	Loc.	*167 Latin Common-Prayer, 12mo. one 12th.	197 Virgil Delphini, 8vo. — — — one 18th.	<i>16.0.0 Bridges</i>
<i>9.5.0 Bridges</i>		168 Medulla Historie Anglicane Howell's one 16th.	198 Ditto — — — — — one 30th.	<i>10.0.0 Bridges</i>
<i>5.0.0 Bridges</i>	169 Ditto — — — — — one 16th.	199 Salmon's Gazetteer, 12mo, — one 10th.	200 Wingate's Arithmetic, 8vo. — one 8th.	<i>7.10.0 Bridges</i>
<i>4.15.0 Bridges</i>	170 Moutoux's Don Quixote, 4 vols. 12mo. and Eighteens — — — one 24th.	201 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	202 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>8.0.0 Bridges</i>
<i>15.5.0 Bridges</i>	171 Meredith's Copies — — — one 16th.	203 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	204 Weeks Preparation, Keeble's, 1st part — — — — — one 16th.	<i>8.0.0 Bridges</i>
<i>4.0.0 — Jones</i>	172 Ovid Metam. Delphini — — — one 24th.	205 Ditto 2d part — — — — — one 8th.	206 Wells's Dionysius, 8vo. — one 8th.	<i>8.0.0 Bridges</i>
	173 — Epistles Delphini — — — one 18th.	207 — Geography to the Maps, 8vo. — — — — — one 3d of 220.	208 Rapin's History of England, with the Heads and Monuments, Genealogical Tables, &c. on 77 Copper-Plates 2 Vols folio. And Rapin's Hist. 15 vols. 8vo. with Heads, Monuments, &c. — — — — — one 8th.	<i>15.0.0 Bridges</i>
	174 Potter's Antiquities, 2 Vols 8vo. one 12th.		209 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>15.0.0 Bridges</i>
	175 Ditto — — — — — one 48th.		210 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>15.0.0 Bridges</i>
<i>7.7.0 Johnson</i>	*176 Puffendorf's Introduction, 3 vols one 8th.		211 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>15.0.0 Bridges</i>
<i>7.15.0 Johnson</i>	177 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.		212 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>15.0.0 Bridges</i>
<i>7.0.0 Johnson</i>	*178 Reflections on Learning, 8vo. — half.		213 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>14.5.0 Bridges</i>
<i>8.0.0 Johnson</i>	179 Ditto — — — — — half.		214 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>14.5.0 Bridges</i>
<i>23.0.0 —</i>	180 Religion of Nature delin. 8vo. one 4th.		215 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	<i>14.5.0 Bridges</i>
<i>23.0.0 —</i>	181 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.		216 Tindal's Continuation, Summary and Me- dallie Hist. 3 vols. Folio, containing 12 Heads engraven by Houbraken, 37 Plates of Medals, 72 Plans, Maps, and Charts. And, Tindal's Continuation, 13 vols. 8vo. — — — — — one 8th.	<i>11.9.0 Bridges</i>
<i>23.0.0 —</i>	181 Ditto — — — — — one 4th.		217 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	
<i>3.15.0 —</i>	182 Stanhope's St Austin, 8vo. — one 10th.		218 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	
<i>3.15.0 —</i>	183 Ditto — — — — — one 10th.		219 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	
<i>25.0.0 —</i>	184 Sherlock on Death, Judgment, Providence, Future State, Sermons, 2 vols Popery — — — — — one 12th.		220 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	
<i>2.2.0 —</i>	185 Scarron's Works, 2 Vols 12mo. one 6th.		221 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	
	186 Sharp's Works, 7 Vols 8vo. and 12mo. — — — — — one 5th.		222 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	
<i>31.10.0 Johnson</i>	187 Shakespeare, 9 vols Eighteens		223 Ditto — — — — — one 8th.	
<i>6.0.0 —</i>	188 Stanhope's Kempis, 8vo. one 8th of a 4th and a 7th of a 3d.			
<i>10.0.0 —</i>	189 Stanhope's Directory, 8vo. two 15ths.			
<i>7.0.0 —</i>	190 Stanhope's Epistles, 8vo. 4 vols. one 12th and one 72d.			
	191 Terence Delphini, 8vo. one 32d and one 240th.			
<i>20.0.0 —</i>	192 Tillotson's Works, folio, 8vo. and eighteens — — — — — one 40th.			
<i>20.0.0 —</i>	193 Ditto — — — — — one 40th.			
<i>15.0.0 —</i>	194 Temple's Works, 2 vols folio 38 two thirds in 500.			
<i>28.0.0 —</i>	195 Tatler, 4 vols 12mo, — — — one 20th.			

APPENDIX E

SOME WILLS,

BIRTHS AND IMPRINTS

The Children of James and Hester Knapton [IGI]\*

1	Hester I	21 Feb 1693
2	John I	26 Mar 1695
3	John II	23 Apr 1696
4	James I	08 Apr 1697
5	Hester II	05 Aug 1698
6	James II	16 Apr 1701
7	William I	28 Aug 1702
8	Paul	20 Jan 1703
9	Rebeckah	17 Jun 1705
10	James III	28 Oct 1706
11	Cisilia	13 Feb 1707
12	William II	22 Apr 1709

[All births registered in London at the parish of Saint Faith under Saint Paul.]

\*International Genealogical Index, compiled by the Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (1980; revised 1981).

Pope/Knapton Imprints

Year	Title/Printed for	[Printer]	Griffith/Foxon
1737	<u>Letters</u> /J Knapton, L Gilliver, J Brindley, R Dodsley [Wright]		4 <sup>o</sup> G454-55
1737	<u>Letters</u> /J Knapton, L Gilliver J Brindley, R Dodsley [Wright]		2 <sup>o</sup> G456-57
1738	<u>Satire II vi</u> /B Motte, C Bathurst, J & P Knapton		2 <sup>o</sup> G479/FS860
1738/	<u>Poems &amp; Imitations of Horace</u> /J & P		4 <sup>o</sup> G504
39	Knapton, L Gilliver, J Brindley, R Dodsley		
1741	<u>Works in Prose II</u> /J & P Knapton, C Bathurst, R Dodsley [Wright]		2 <sup>o</sup> G529-30
1741	<u>Works in Prose II</u> /J & P Knapton, C Bathurst, R Dodsley [Wright]		4 <sup>o</sup> G531
1743/	<u>Essay on Man I</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer]		4 <sup>o</sup> ---/[see F
49?			P865]
1744/	<u>Epistles to Several Persons</u> /		4 <sup>o</sup> G591/[See
48	J & P Knapton [suppressed] [Bowyer]		Twick III ii xiii]
1745	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer]		8 <sup>o</sup> [Maslen twin
	[same as Rothschild 1619/FP868?]		of G607]
1745	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer]		8 <sup>o</sup> G607/FP867
1745	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer]		8 <sup>o</sup> G608/FP869
1746	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer]		8 <sup>o</sup> G620/FP871
1747	<u>Ethic Epistles</u> /J & P Knapton [---]		8 <sup>o</sup> [piracy?]
1748	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer]		8 <sup>o</sup> ---/FP872
1748	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer]		8 <sup>o</sup> G631/FP873
1749	<u>Dunciad</u> /J & P Knapton [Bowyer?]		8 <sup>o</sup> G638/FP800
1751	<u>Works</u> /J & P Knapton, H Lintot, [Bowyer]		8 <sup>o</sup> G643-51
	J & R Tonson, S Draper		
1751	<u>Works</u> /J & P Knapton, H Lintot, J & R Tonson, S Draper		8 <sup>o</sup> G653
1751	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton		8 <sup>o</sup> G656
1752-	<u>Works</u> /J & P Knapton, H Lintot, [Bowyer/		8 <sup>o</sup>
1754	J & R Tonson, S Draper, Strahan]		
	C Bathurst [1752 9 vols/1753 9 vols/1754 10 vols]		
1753	<u>Essay on Man</u> /J & P Knapton		8 <sup>o</sup>
1755	<u>Histoire de Martinus Scriblerus</u> / 'chez Paul Knapton'		12 <sup>o</sup> [Londres/Paris?]

## APPENDIX E: WILLS

The following wills have been included as the final tallying up of Pope's posthumous booksellers and editor. Pope's will itself was published in two contemporary pamphlets as well as the Gentleman's Magazine; more recently, a copy of it has been appended to Maynard Mack's The Garden and the City. Wills are not necessarily completely accurate documents. John Wilkes's generous bequests, for example, were more ostentation than reality as his estate was found to be almost bankrupt. However, in the case of John Knapton and William Warburton, we have no reason to suspect that their wills do not represent the full extent of their financial estate.

Paul Knapton did not make a will which suggests his death may have been sudden. His wife, Elizabeth, was eventually granted his goods, chattels and credits. What amount she may have received from his share in the book business is unknown, but John Knapton (who remained a bachelor to the end of his days) left his brother's widow £1000.

Warburton provided amply for his wife, Gertrude, who had inherited £5000 from her uncle, Ralph Allen, in 1764. Most of his fortune, however, was to be invested in stocks and annuities by Hurd, Balguy, and Skinner. While Andrew Millar made various provisions for Fielding's sons, Hume, and booksellers, Warburton left nothing for the trade.

. . .



PAUL KNAPTON (INTESTATE)

September 1756

PRO: Prob.6 (September 1755)

[As Paul Knapton died without making a will, his estate was governed under 'Administrations'.]

Paul Knapton On the twenty third day

Admon: of the Goods Chattels and

Credits of Paul Knapton late of the March

Parish of St. Gregory London deced

was granted to Elizabeth Knapton

Widow the Relief of the said deced Sept<sup>r</sup> 1756

having been the first sworn duly

to adstr

## JOHN KNAPTON'S WILL

6 October 1770

PRO: Prob.11.961.f.367

[John Knapton, the London bookseller, appoints his cousin George Knapton, Esq., now of Chelsea; John Partridge of Basinghall Street, London; and Robert Horsfield of London, bookseller, as his executors. They are to administer the sum of £4000 upon trust and 'to place out the same at interest in their names in some of the Government or publick funds' or to make property investments 'by way of mortgages'. The interest of this trust is to go to George Knapton; upon his decease it is to be transferred to the five daughters of a late cousin [Aber?] Knapton of Lymington. A provision of £1000 to be paid out over the next twelve months is made for Elizabeth Knapton, widow of his late brother Paul.

Other bequests are as follow: £100 to George Knapton; £200 to John Partridge; £500 to Robert Horsfield; £50 each to the five daughters of his late cousin; £50 to his cousin John Simmonds; £100 to his cousin Martha Botham; £50 to Elizabeth Knapton; £50 to Charles Knapton; £20 to another cousin; £20 to John Beecroft, a London bookseller; £50 to his servant Robert Eve; £10 to each of his maid-servants; and £10 to his coachman. To his cousin John Simmonds he bequeaths all messuages, tenements, etc. with the appurtenances in the parish of St Andrew [Norwich?].

Knapton wishes to be buried in the vault of the churchyard at Upminster, Essex. His will is witnessed on 25 September 1765 by William Gardiner, [Whichcof?] Turner, and Snute Shrimpton, yeoman. Two codicils are added: the first,

dated 23 June 1767 and witnessed by Miles Halsey, Andrew Millar, and John Chase, transfers the rights to all messuages, tenements, and hereditaments to George Knapton (and thereafter to Elizabeth Knapton and the five daughters of his late cousin), as John Simmonds has died; the second codicil gives £30 to Thomas Pethry and £30 to Anne Price, his maid-servant (in addition to the £10 already provided in his will).

John Knapton's will, with its two codicils, was proved at London on 6 October 1770.]

WARBURTON

23 July 1777

Egerton 1960.ff.11-12

[Part of a will]

[f.11] For Miss Cathe [?] Malet to be given to my Wife by her, when she sees proper. As I am bishop of Gloucester it is not improper to have me buried in the College at the Church there, with as little expense as possible. But this with the certain [?] approbation & good liking of my wife, and principally to save [?] her the expense of having me carried to the Burial place at Claverton near Bath.

W. Gloucester

[f.12] This is the last will & testament of Mr.  
William Warburton<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>This late attempt at writing a will is scarcely legible and fades into a scrawl. An account of Warburton's will, proved at London on 6 July 1779, follows.

## WARBURTON'S WILL

6 July 1779

PRO: Prob.11.328

[In his will Warburton leaves £200 to his sister Frances, a spinster, £100 to his servant, and £2000 to his wife Gertrude. He also bequeaths to his wife whatever books and prints she cares to select; the rest of his collection is to be sold by his trustees, the profits given to the governors of the Gloucester Infirmary.

The lion's share of his fortune - £20,000 - is to be invested by his trustees, Richard, Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; the Reverend Thomas Balguy, Archdeacon of Winchester; and John Skinner, Stock[broker?] of the City of Gloucester, Gent. They are instructed to invest the £20,000 in public stocks or funds with the consent of his wife.

Warburton sets up various annuities for his sister and his nephew, Robert Noyes.

Two codicils are added, the first relating to an £800 loan to his nephew, the second bequeathing all messuages, lands, and real estate to his wife.

The will and its two codicils were proved at London on 6 July 1779. The witnesses were William Griffith and J. Price.]

APPENDIX F

POPE'S 1747 ETHIC EPISTLES:

AN UNRECORDED EDITION



APPENDIX F: POPE'S 1747 'ETHIC EPISTLES'

[N.B. The following is an attempt to weld three ideas which have been mentioned in the course of this thesis: the problem of piracy; title designation; and Pope's frontispiece. It is intended to supplement K.I.D. Maslen's 'New Editions of Pope's Essay on Man 1745-48', Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 62 (1968), 177-88.]

The 1747 edition of Pope's Ethic Epistles has never, to my knowledge, been properly documented. Griffith did not record it in his Alexander Pope: A Bibliography (1922/27); nor did Foxon make a note of it in his English Verse 1701-1750 (1975).<sup>1</sup> Neither Mack nor Bateson included the 1747 Ethic Epistles which contains An Essay on Man and Epistles to Several Persons in the critical apparatus to their respective volumes (III i and III ii) in the Twickenham edition.

This would seem to be a very rare edition indeed to have escaped the notice of the most scrupulous bibliographers and editors of Pope in the twentieth century. However, at least two eminent Pope scholars have known of the existence of the 1747 Ethic Epistles. W.K. Wimsatt pays this edition brief notice in The Portraits of Alexander Pope in a footnote to the series of line and stipple medallions appearing in Warburton editions of An Essay on Man between 1745 and 1753:

<sup>1</sup> Foxon acknowledges the need for a revised Pope bibliography and prefaces his own protean catalogue with the stipulation that 'No attempt has been made to list the collections of Pope's works'.

An inferior medallion of this type [43.3] but lacking the signature of A. Pond appears on the title page of a volume I once saw in the collection of Professor George Sherburn: Ethic Epistles. by Alexander Pope Esq; London, Printed for J. and P. Knapton in Ludgate-street. MDCCXLVII (not recorded in Griffith). This volume contained the Essay on Man and Moral Essays.<sup>2</sup> It had a frontispiece from Pope's design.

The medallion appearing in the National Library of Scotland copy of the 1747 Ethic Epistles substantiates Wimsatt's description: this unsigned title-page profile of Pope looking left is a rougher version of the medallion by 'APond f.' on the title-page of the 1745 Warburton edition of An Essay on Man. Pope looks somewhat worse for wear in the later medallion - heavier facial stippling makes Pope look even more unshaven, his eye has become puffier, more fish-like, and his nose has been rounded off in the 1747 profile. Side by side, the 1745 image gives the impression of Roman manliness while the 1747 version suggests an aftermath of Pope in his cups. The 1747 medallion is fractionally smaller than the 1745 (4.1 cm. in diameter/plate mark=4.6 x 4.7 cm.; 1745 is 4.2 cm.diameter/plate mark=4.9 x 5.0 cm.).

One minor but telling detail about Wimsatt's footnote needs to be clarified: the first part of the 1747 Ethic Epistles contains An Essay on Man (as Wimsatt says), but the half-title for the second part reads 'Ethic Epistles,

<sup>2</sup>W.K. Wimsatt, The Portraits of Alexander Pope (New Haven and London: 1965), 192, n. 3.

The Second Book. To Several Persons.' The Moral Essays title, which Bateson parenthesized on the title-page of the Twickenham Epistles to Several Persons, was introduced by Warburton in the 1751 edition of Pope's works. Bateson viewed Warburton's innovation with some disdain and based his own editorial decision on the authority of Pope's 'death-bed' Epistles to Several Persons which was suppressed until 1748. Bateson shored up his choice thus:

All Pope's references to the four poems in his letters are to his "Epistles". The expanded alteration "Ethic Epistles", used by some modern scholars—though preferable to "Moral Essays" (a title invented by Warburton after Pope's death)—would not have been acceptable to Pope himself, who only uses it as a general title for E. on Man and the four Epistles considered as a single entity. See, for example, his letter to Warburton of 18 January 1742/3 (Sherburn, IV 439). The running title to Epistles to Several Persons (1744) is simply "Epistles".<sup>3</sup>

Apart from bibliographical intimations of authorial intention, Bateson offered a semantic explanation. The title, Epistles to Several Persons,

describes more accurately the nature of the four poems. To a reader of the early eighteenth century the word "essay" had a more formidable connotation than it has today. The combination of "moral" and "essays", instead of suggesting, as it might to us, Addison's Saturday numbers of The Spectator,

<sup>3</sup>Pope, Epistles to Several Persons (Moral Essays), edited by F.W. Bateson. (London: 1951; 2nd ed. 1961), ix, n. 3. [Cited as Twickenham III ii.]

would then have been more likely to suggest some such dismal treatise as James Lowde's Moral Essays wherein some of Mr. Lock's and Mons<sup>r</sup>. Malbranch's opinions are briefly examin'd (1699). The effect of Warburton's title therefore was to put all the emphasis on the didactic elements in the poems. Here, it proclaimed, is another Essay on Man! It called attention, in other words, to all that is weakest and most pretentious in the four Epistles and ignored altogether the social satire and worldly wisdom in which their real strength lies.<sup>4</sup>

Bateson might have drawn a more contemporary example of a 'moral essays' title than Lowde's 1699 treatise. Hume's Essays Moral and Political (1741, -42, -48), however, was an attempt to reach a wider market than the 'dead-born' Treatise of Human Nature, adapting the Spectator formula to mid-century controversies.

When John Butt, the general editor, condensed the Twickenham series into the one-volume edition of 1963, he reversed Bateson's title thus: Moral Essays [Epistles to Several Persons] at the head of the four poems and reinstated Moral Essays in the contents page, the chronological table, and the running head. Further complicating (or at least challenging) the issue, Herbert Davis completely banished the Moral Essays title from the 1966 Oxford Standard Authors edition of Pope's Poetical Works, maintaining the 1744 Epistles to Several Persons title, a decision with which Pat Rogers concurred in the revised edition. Davis took the defiant step of adding

<sup>4</sup>Twickenham III ii, xxxvii.

a fifth epistle, 'To Mr. Addison' (which Pope wrote in 1715), to this particular group of poems. 'It is my modest hope,' concluded Davis in his preface, 'that it [his edition] may demonstrate that there are more ways than one of editing texts printed in the eighteenth century.' In this context it is worthwhile noting that W.K. Wimsatt adopted the Moral Essays title in his 1951 (rpt. 1972) American edition which also included 'To Mr. Addison' and added, oddly enough, the phrase In Four Epistles to Several Persons to the head title of the group of five.

John Barnard brought up the matter of title designation in his commemorative article, 'F.W. Bateson, Pope, and Editing'.<sup>5</sup> Looking at Bateson's Twickenham edition, he observed

Even the book's spine offers an immediate challenge. Epistles to Several Persons is a title embodying an editorial decision and implying a critical stance. . . . The more grandiose title reflects Pope's intentions, which actively occupied his mind from 1729 to 1735, and were never entirely given up, of creating an 'Opus Magnum', of which the Essay on Man would have been the introductory part serving as a scale for 'a general Map of MAN' with the four epistles to Cobham, to a Lady, to Bathurst and to Burlington, forming no more than the first two books of the whole.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup>In Essays in Criticism, vol. XXIX, no. 2 (April 1979), 124-38.

<sup>6</sup>Essays in Criticism, p. 128

Barnard went on to say that 'the plan lost impetus' and suggested that the blueprint for the 'Opus Magnum' in the 1744 advertisement might have been drawn up by Warburton. One of the weaknesses in Bateson's argument concerning the title, as Barnard pointed out, lies in the fact that Pope referred to many of his epistolary poems as 'ethic epistles'. In the 1735 Works there are no fewer than seven poems grouped under the half-title 'ETHIC EPISTLES, | THE | SECOND BOOK. | TO | SEVERAL PERSONS.' The last of these, 'To Dr. Arbuthnot', was to become an editorial oddity when Warburton turned it into a 'Prologue to the Satires' in the 1751 Works.

Underlying the ambiguity over titles is the larger, more complex problem of Pope's artistic direction in the 1730s. Was he content with the diversity of imitating and updating Horace or was he committed to a higher, more philosophically unifying, 'Opus Magnum' ideal? Bateson's selection of the Epistles to Several Persons title suggests that he supported the former proposal and that Pope, in the 'death-bed' quarto, was declaring his abandonment of the 'Opus Magnum' scheme in preference to the more social, urbane and chaotic atmosphere of the Imitatio Horatii. Yet Barnard leaned more towards the 'magisterial simplicity' of the Moral Essays title, although, following Bateson, he thought 'Pope's essential genius did not encompass the ability to



to build up large intellectual structures'. The split in critical opinion over Pope's intentions to build either a disparate collection or a unified 'general Map of MAN' is exemplified in such works as Reuben Brower's Alexander Pope: The Poetry of Allusion (1959) which states that Pope's direction became 'progressively an Imitatio Horatii' and Miriam Leranbaum's Alexander Pope's 'Opus Magnum' 1729-1744 (1977) which defends the unified structure of the 'moral essays'.

The 1747 Ethic Epistles does little to shed light on the question of titles, being neither 'moral' nor 'to several persons', but hearkening back to the 1735 half-title. Its main interest lies in the fact that it re-incorporates the Essay on Man with the four Epistles before the release of the suppressed 'death-bed' edition of Epistles to Several Persons in 1748. At first glance, it might appear that Warburton was indecisive as to what to call the body of poems and attempted to revive Pope's half-completed 'Opus Magnum'. But, for reasons given below, this edition was more than likely not sanctioned by Warburton; and as such the 1747 Ethic Epistles should have no bearing on the textual apparatus for either of the Twickenham volumes.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup>The 1747 Ethic Epistles shed further light on the 'bibliographical limbo' circumscribed by K.I.D. Maslen in his article, 'New Editions of Pope's Essay on Man 1745-48', PBSA, 62 (1968), 177-88.

One possible explanation for the scarcity of the 1747 Ethic Epistles is that it was unauthorized by Warburton. His name appears nowhere in this edition (unlike the small octavo editions of the Essay on Man which were published between 1745 and 1748), and the comparatively few footnotes are all Pope's own. The advertisement describing the frontispiece is presumably by Warburton, although this may have been used without his permission. Might Bolingbroke have ordered the edition to be published in order to deprive Warburton from some of the profits he was making from the small octavo Essay on Man editions?

Another possibility is that the edition was a piracy: the frontispiece is discernibly different from the 1744 original, as is the vignette of Pope on the title page different from that appearing on the 1745 Essay on Man title page. The printing of the 1747 edition is apparently unrecorded in the Bowyer ledgers, and no advertisements are to be found in Gentleman's Magazine or London Magazine (although not all of the small octavo Essay on Man editions were advertised).

One sure sign that Warburton would not have approved of the 1747 edition is the fact that his former patron, 'SUTTON', is fully named for the first time in Bathurst.\* Elsewhere, the name had appeared as 'S\*\*n' or 'S—on' in

---

\*N.B. Pope spelled 'Sutton' out in full in Dialogue I, 1738b (Works II ii).

Pope's lifetime. Warburton went to great pains to explain Sutton's innocence in the Charitable Corporation scandal, and his name was accordingly replaced with an imaginary 'Bishop' in the 'death-bed' edition. Warburton added a long note of explanation concerning the change in the 1751 Works III 230, that Sutton 'was unwarily drawn in by a pack of infamous Cheats' (Epistle to Bathurst, l. 107). Thus Warburton, had he read the 1747 text, would have been most anxious to have it suppressed. Perhaps the publication of the 1747 Ethic Epistles expedited the release of the suppressed 'death-bed' quarto of Epistles to Several Persons in the following year.

It would seem most unlikely that John and Paul Knapton would publish an edition expected to arouse Warburton's antipathy; as the main publishers of Pope's works and of Warburton's religious tracts, they would certainly not have wanted to jeopardize their own best interests. They stood little to gain and much to lose by going against Warburton's wishes. However, Warburton was spending more and more time at Prior Park, away from the bustle of the London book-trade, and it is conceivable that crossed signals (perhaps Warburton's and Bolingbroke's) could have resulted in the publication of an unsatisfactory edition. On the other hand, the 1747 edition might have been an enterprising publisher's way of cashing in before the quarto edition came on the market.

The frontispiece to the 1747 Ethic Epistles is worthy of notice, if only because its absence from the 1751 Works was detected by a correspondent to the Gentleman's Magazine in August of the same year.

QUERY. Whether the new edition of Mr Pope's works can be called a complete edition of his works, as the editor has omitted the frontispiece to the Essay on Man, which he before had so highly praised, and which, as he had said before, in the advertisement to the small edition, was designed and drawn up by Mr Pope himself. A.L.

In place of Pope's design, a new series of cuts designed by Blakey and engraved by Ravenet and Scotin was commissioned for the third volume of the 1751 edition. The 'small edition' referred to by the above reader could be any one of a number of small octavo editions of the Essay on Man published between 1745 and 1748. Pope's frontispiece would be used again in the 1755 small octavo Essay on Man.

The sepia drawing by Pope which faces the title-page of the Twickenham Essay on Man differs slightly from the frontispiece which was published by J. and P. Knapton on 6 February 1744. Two statuesque figures on the coliseum in the background have disappeared from Pope's design; and the frontispiece adds a candlestick holder (beside Pope's be-laurelled skull) as well as four sun-beams. Pope's name appears above 'INV.' on a tablet in the lower left-hand

corner in both states. Published a few months before Pope's death, the frontispiece did not appear in an edition of An Essay on Man until the following year. Perhaps Pope's engraver finished the copperplate too late accompany the 1744 quarto edition.

Pope's frontispiece was described in the February 1745 issue of Gentleman's Magazine (98). Like Hogarth's Tail Piece: The Bathos, Pope's design depicts a world which is falling apart. Hogarth's later Father Time exhales the word 'FINIS' in a puff of smoke while Pope's philosopher sits idly blowing bubbles. Pope's ironic Latin mottoes, 'VIRO IMMORT:', 'SIC TRANSIT GLORIA MUNDI', 'CAPITAL IMMOBILE SAXUM', and 'ROMA Æ TERNA' find allusive translations in Hogarth's 'H. Nature Bankrupt', 'The Worlds End', the bequeathal to 'Chaos', and the igniting 'TIMES'. Pope has a fallen statue, a broken flute, a crumbling coliseum; Hogarth a dead Apollo, a broken scythe, a dilapidated tower. In 1744 the tree still has leaves; in 1764 the tree is stark. Both designs have been executed by men acutely aware of impending death.

For Pope, the design seems entirely opposite to the work it was intended to preface. One would expect a Rome-in-all-its-glory scenario to mirror the ordered rationale of An Essay on Man. It might better have suited the Dunciad, and yet Pope's directions are clear enough: the 1744 frontis-



piece which Pope presumably oversaw carried both the instructions to the binder, 'Essay on Man . . . to face the Title', and the subjacent couplet from the fourth epistle, lines 287-88, which Pope had penned at the foot of his sepia drawing. Thus his designation would seem to be clear enough.

Why then depict such a scene of breakdown and decay? Does the frontispiece to the Essay on Man form an impressionistic confession of failure to fulfil the 'Opus Magnum' design? Perhaps, as has been suggested by David Foxon, Pope lost his nerve after the various assaults on him from the press in the 1730s and, especially, after Crousaz published his Examen in 1737. Warburton ingratiated himself by publicly defending Pope, and yet it was Warburton who urged him to revise The Dunciad. Pope ended his career by giving full vent to his satiric impulses, creating, as it were, an anti-Opus Magnum. In doing so he abandoned his 'general Map of MAN'. By prefacing his late (and ultimately posthumous) editions of An Essay on Man with his own ironic testament of the world's decline, Pope perhaps intended his philosophical masterpiece to be read as the beginning of an ideal scheme which failed to achieve fruition. To what extent Pope's grand design became thwarted by satire, cynicism, and despair is still being pondered, but the 1744 frontispiece might be regarded as the ontological turning point between the Essay on Man and the Dunciad.



[Bibliographical entry for 1747 Ethic Epistles]

1747

unrecorded

Title, in black and redETHIC | EPISTLES. | BY | ALEXANDER POPE Esq; |

{vignette: head of Pope, unsigned, 42 mm diameter,

plate mark=46 x 47 mm}

LONDON: | Printed for J. and P. KNAPTON in Ludgate-street. |  
MDCCXLVII.Collation, small octavo;  $\pi$ I;  $a$ - $a^6$ ; A-F<sup>8</sup>.frontispiece;  $\underline{1}$ - $\underline{v}$ ; vi-xi;  $\underline{xii}$ - $\underline{xiv}$ ;  $\underline{1}$ -96.Press-figures, noneType, Caslon

Contents, frontispiece  $\pi$ I, title  $\underline{a}$ I (v. blank), The Design  $\underline{a}^2$ , The Contents  $\underline{a}^3$ - $\underline{a}^5$  ( $\underline{a}^5$  v. blank), half-title An Essay on Man, Being the First Book of Ethic Epistles. To H. St. John L. Bolingbroke.  $\underline{a}^6$  ( $\underline{a}^6$  v. Advertisement), text of Essay on Man A<sup>I</sup>-C<sup>5</sup> (C<sup>5</sup> v. blank), half-title Ethic Epistles, the Second Book. To Several Persons. [six lines from Horace] C<sup>6</sup>, The Contents C<sup>7</sup>-C<sup>8</sup>, Epistle I (to Cobham) D<sup>I</sup>-D<sup>5</sup>, Epistle II (to a Lady) D<sup>5</sup> v.-D<sup>8</sup> v., Epistle III (to Bathurst) E<sup>I</sup>-F<sup>2</sup> v., Epistle IV (to Burlington) F<sup>3</sup>-F<sup>7</sup> (F<sup>7</sup> v. blank), The Universal Prayer F<sup>8</sup> r, v.

Notes, no instructions to the binder on frontispiece

[different state from 6 February 1744 frontispiece];

title-page vignette unsigned; advertisement presumably by Warburton, although his name appears nowhere in this edition; all footnotes by Pope; possibly unauthorized.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

N.B. It would be of little service to the reader to duplicate a list of the texts I have had piled around me in the North Library of the British Museum. This has already been done by R.C. Alston and M.J. Jannetta in their fortuitous trial-run for the Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue, entitled Bibliography Machine Readable Cataloguing and the ESTC (The British Library, 1978). My main bibliographical source has been Donald F. Bond's The Eighteenth Century (Chicago, 1975), which is supplemented by Modern Language Association catalogues and Roger D. Lund's Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature 1660-1740 (New York, 1980). The Lopez and Tobin bibliographies are noted below.

## I: MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

British Library: Additional MSS. 4312.ff.29-44 (Knapton-Birch); 4475.f.169; 4948.A.f.466 (Bolingbroke); 27,995.f.7 (Warburton-Hogarth); 35,588.f.91 (Bolingbroke-Mallet); 37,683.f.33; 38,730.f.10; Ashley B.VII3706-4019; Egerton 1954.ff.1-109 (Warburton-Knapton); 1955.f.34; 1956 (Theobald-Warburton); 1957 (Hanmer-Warburton); 1958 (Hurd-Warburton); 1959.ff.17-30 (Warburton-Millar); 1960.ff.11-12.

EUL: Dc.4.102; Dc.8.47; La.II.153, 423, 646.255; Gen.968.f.74.

NLS: Add.MSS. 968.f.74 (Warburton-Gosling); 3942.f.12.

Other: Gosling Ledgers; Bowyer Ledgers; PRO; Sun Fire Archives.

## II: PRIMARY SOURCES

Pope, Alexander. The Twickenham Edition of the Poems.  
general editor, John Butt. 11 volumes in 12.  
London and New Haven, Conn., 1939-1969.

I Pastoral Poetry and An Essay on Criticism.  
ed. E. Audra and Aubrey Williams. London, 1961.

II The Rape of the Lock and Other Poems.  
ed. Geoffrey Tillotson. 3rd ed. London, 1962.

III i An Essay on Man. ed. Maynard Mack.  
London, 1950; New Haven, Conn., 1951.

III ii Epistles to Several Persons (Moral Essays).  
ed. F.W. Bateson. 2nd ed. London, 1961.

IV Imitations of Horace, with An Epistle to Dr.  
Arbuthnot and the Epilogue to the Satires.  
ed. John Butt. London, 1939.

V The Dunciad. ed. James Sutherland. 3rd ed.  
London, 1963.

VI Minor Poems. ed. Norman Ault and John Butt.  
London, 1954.

VII-VIII The Iliad. ed. Maynard Mack et al.  
London, 1967.

IX-X The Odyssey. ed. Maynard Mack et al.  
London, 1967.

XI Index. ed. Maynard Mack. London, 1969.

———. The Poems of Alexander Pope. one vol. ed.  
ed. John Butt. London, 1963; rpt 1977.

———. Poetical Works. ed. Herbert Davis. Oxford,  
1966; rev. with introd. by Pat Rogers, 1978.

———. The Works of Alexander Pope. ed. Whitwell  
Elwin and William John Courthope. 10 vols.  
London, 1871-1889.

———. The Works of Alexander Pope Esq. ed. William  
Warburton. 9 vols. London, 1751.

———. The Works of Mr. Alexander Pope. London.  
vol. I, 1717; vol. II, 1735.

———. The Correspondence of Alexander Pope. ed.  
George Sherburn. 5 vols. Oxford, 1956.

## III: SECONDARY SOURCES

[All places of publication are London unless otherwise given.]

- Addison, Joseph, and Richard Steele. Critical Essays from the Spectator. ed. Donald F. Bond. Oxford, 1970
- Aden, John M. Something Like Horace: studies in the art and allusion of Pope's Horatian satires. Nashville, 1969
- Alston, R.C., and M.J. Jannetta. Bibliography Machine Readable Cataloguing and the ESTC. The British Library, 1978
- Ambler, Charles. Reports of Cases. (1730-1783)
- Atkins, John Tracy. Reports of Cases. (1735-1754)
- Augustan Reprint Society
- Ault, Norman. New Light of Pope. 1949
- Barker, Nicolas. 'Pope and his Publishers'. Times Literary Supplement. 3 September 1976, p. 1085
- Barnard, John, ed. Pope: the critical heritage. 1973
- Bateson, F.W., and N.A. Joukovsky, eds. Alexander Pope: a critical anthology. 1971
- Bedford, Emmett G., and Robert Dilligan. Concordance to the Poems of Alexander Pope. 2 vols, Detroit, 1974
- Belanger, Terry. 'Booksellers' Sales of Copyright: aspects of the London book trade 1718-1768'. Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 1970
- . 'Booksellers' Trade Sales, 1718-1768'. The Library 5th series, XXX, 4 (December 1975), 281-302
- . 'Publishers and writers in eighteenth-century England'. Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England. ed. Isabel Rivers. Leicester, 1982
- Beljame, Alexandre. Men of Letters and the English Public in the eighteenth-century, 1660-1744. 1881; trans. and edited by Bonamy Dobrée, 1948
- Bibliography and Textual Criticism: English and American Literature. 1700 to the Present. ed. O.M. Brack and Warner Barnes. Chicago, 1969
- Bond, Donald F., compiler. The Eighteenth Century. Northbrook, Ill., 1975

Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England.  
ed. Isabel Rivers. Leicester, 1982

Boswell's Life of Johnson. ed. George Birkbeck Hill,  
revised and enlarged by L.F. Powell. 6 vols.  
Oxford, 1934

Boyce, Benjamin. The Benevolent Man. Cambridge, Mass., 1967

British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies [BJECS]

Brownell, Morris R. Alexander Pope and the Arts of  
Georgian England. Oxford, 1979

Bunbury, Sir Henry. The Correspondence of Sir Thomas  
Hanmer, Bart. 1838

Butt, John E. 'Editorial Problems in Eighteenth-Century  
Poetry'. Editing Donne and Pope. George R. Potter  
and John Butt. Los Angeles, 1952

———. 'Pope's Poetical Manuscripts'. Proceedings of  
the British Academy. 40 (1954), 23-29 [rpt Essential  
Articles, ed. Maynard Mack (1968)]

———. 'Pope Seen Through his Letters'. Eighteenth-  
Century Literature. ed. James L. Clifford. 1959,  
pp. 62-67

———. 'Pope: the Man and the Poet'. Of Books and  
Humankind: essays and poems presented to Bonamy Dobrée.  
ed. John Butt. 1964, pp. 69-79

———. The Augustan Age. New York, 1966

———. Pope, Dickens and Others: essays and addresses.  
Edinburgh, 1969

———. The Mid-Eighteenth Century. ed. and completed  
by Geoffrey Carnall. The Oxford History of English Lit-  
erature. gen. eds. John Buxton and Norman Davis. VII  
Oxford, 1979

[The] Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. II.  
1660-1800. ed. F.W. Bateson. Cambridge, 1969

Carré, Jacques. 'Burlington's Literary Patronage' BJECS  
5, no. 1 (Spring 1982), 21-34

Carter, Elizabeth. A Series of Letters between Mrs. Eliza-  
beth Carter and Miss Catherine Talbot, from the year  
1741 to 1770. ed. Montagu Pennington. 2 vols. 1808

Carter, Harry. A History of the Oxford University Press.  
I. To the year 1780. Oxford, 1975



- Cash, Arthur. Laurence Sterne: the early & middle years. 1975
- Cherpack, Clifton. 'Warburton and the Encyclopédie'. Comparative Literature. 7 (1955), 226-39
- Clifford, James L. Young Samuel Johnson. 1957
- . Dictionary Johnson. 1979
- Cochrane, J.A. Dr. Johnson's Printer: the life of William Strahan. 1964
- Collins, Arthur. Authorship in the Days of Johnson: being a study of the relation between author, patron, publisher and public, 1726-1780. 1927
- Cowler, Rosemary. 'Shadow and Substance: a discussion of Pope's correspondence'. The Familiar Letter in the Eighteenth Century. ed. Howard Anderson, Philip B. Daghljan and Irvin Ehrenpreis. Lawrence, Kansas, 1966, pp. 34-48
- Curry, Stephen J. 'The Literary Criticism of William Warburton'. English Studies. 48 (1967), 398-408
- Dash, Irene G. 'A Glimpse of the Sublime in Warburton's Edition of The Winter's Tale'. Shakespeare Studies. 11 (1978), 159-74
- Davis, Herbert. 'Bowyer's Paper Stock Ledger'. The Library. 5th series, VI (1951), 73-87
- . 'Correspondence of the Augustans'. The Familiar Letters in the Eighteenth Century. ed. Howard Anderson, Philip B. Daghljan and Irvin Ehrenpreis. Lawrence, Kansas, 1966, pp. 1-14
- Dawson, Giles. 'Warburton, Hanmer, and the 1745 edition of Shakespeare'. Studies in Bibliography. II (1949-50), 35-48
- Dearing, Vinton A. 'Alexander Pope'. New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. ed. George Watson. II Cambridge, 1971, 500-27
- Dickinson, H.T. Bolingbroke. 1970
- Dickson, P.G.M. The Financial Revolution in England. 1967
- D'Israeli, Isaac. Quarrels of Authors. 3 vols. 1814
- Dixon, Peter. The World of Pope's Satires: an introduction to the 'Epistles' and 'Imitations of Horace'. 1968
- , ed. Alexander Pope. Writers and their Backgrounds. 1972



Dobrée, Bonamy. 'Pope's Horace'. Times Literary Supplement. (12 August 1939), p. 479

———. Alexander Pope. 1951

———. English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century, 1700-1740. The Oxford History of English Literature. gen. ed. F.P. Wilson and Bonamy Dobrée. VII Oxford, 1959

Doddridge, Philip. Calendar of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge D.D. (1702-1751). compiled and ed. Geoffrey F. Nuttall. Historical Manuscripts Commission JP 26, 1979 HMSO

Doherty, Francis. 'Sterne and Warburton: another look'. BJECS. I (1978), 20-30

Douglas, D.C. English Scholars. 1939

Dyson, H.V.D., and John E. Butt. Augustans and Romantics 1689-1830. 1940; rev. 1950

Editing Eighteenth-Century Texts. ed. D.I.B. Smith. Toronto, 1938

Eighteenth-Century British Books: an author union catalogue. comp. F.J.G. Robinson, G. Averley, D.R. Esslemont and P.J. Wallis. 5 vols. Newcastle, 1981 [see also the subject catalogue and list of foreign publications]

### Eighteenth-Century Life

Eighteenth-Century Literature. ed. James L. Clifford Oxford, 1959

Erskine-Hill, Howard. Pope: The Dunciad. 1972

Erskine-Hill, Howard, and Anne Smith, eds. The Art of Alexander Pope. 1979

### Essays in Criticism

Evans, A.W. Warburton and the Warburtonians: a study in some eighteenth-century controversies. Oxford, 1932

Evidence in Literary Scholarship: essays in memory of James Marshall Osborn. eds. René Wellek and Alvaro Ribiero. Oxford, 1979

### Factotum: Newsletter of the XVIIIth Century STC

Fairer, David. 'The Writing and Printing of Joseph Warton's Essay on Pope'. Studies in Bibliography. XXX (1977), 211-19

Feather, John. 'The Book Trade in Politics: the making of the Copyright Act of 1710'. Publishing History. VIII (1980), 19-44

———. 'John Nourse and his Authors'. Studies in Bibliography. XXXIV (1981), 205-26

———. 'The English Book Trade and the Law, 1695-1799'. Publishing History. XII (1982), 51-76

Fleeman, J.D. 'The revenue of a writer: Samuel Johnson's literary earnings'. Studies in the Book Trade: in honour of Graham Pollard. Oxford, 1975, pp. 211-30

Fielding, Henry. The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling. 6 vols. 1749; rpt 1981

Fifoot, C.H.S. Lord Mansfield. 1936

Fisher, Alan S. 'The Stretching of Augustan Satire: Charles Churchill's "Dedication" to Warburton'. Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 72 (1973), 360-77

Fleeman, J.D. '18th-Century Printing Ledgers'. Times Literary Supplement. (19 December 1963), p. 1056

———. 'The revenue of a writer: Samuel Johnson's literary earnings'. Studies in the Book Trade: in honour of Graham Pollard. Oxford, 1975, pp. 211-30

Foxon, David Fairweather. The Technique of Bibliography. Cambridge, 1955

———. 'Concealed Pope Editions'. Book Collector 5 (1956), 277-79

———. 'Two cruces in Pope bibliography'. Times Literary Supplement (24 January 1958), p. 52

———, ed. English Bibliographical Sources. series I Periodical Lists of New Publications. 7 vols. 1964

———. Thoughts on the History and Future of Bibliographical Description. Los Angeles, 1970

———. English Verse 1701-1750: a catalogue of separately printed poems with notes on contemporary editions. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1975

———. 'Pope and the Early Eighteenth-Century Book Trade'. [typescript of the Lyell lectures, 1975, in the British Library]

———. 'Greg's "Rationale" and the Editing of Pope'. The Library. 5th series, XXXIII (June 1978), 119-24

- Ford, Boris, ed. From Dryden to Johnson. Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 4. 1957; rpt and rev. 1983
- Gaskell, Philip. 'Notes on Eighteenth-Century British Paper'. The Library. 5th series, 12 (1957), 34-42
- . A New Introduction to Bibliography. Oxford, 1972
- George, M.D. London Life in the Eighteenth Century. 1925; rev. 1966
- . England in Johnson's Day. 1928
- Goulden, R.J. Some Chancery Lawsuits 1714-1758: an analytical list. Croydon, Surrey, 1983
- Gilboy, E. Wages in the eighteenth-century. 1934
- Griffin, Dustin H. Alexander Pope: the poet in the poems. Princeton, 1978
- Griffith, Reginald Harvey. Alexander Pope: a bibliography 2 vols. Austin, Texas, 1922/27
- . 'Pope Editing Pope'. Texas Studies in English. Austin, 1945, pp. 5-108
- Guerinot, J.V. Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope 1711-1744: a descriptive bibliography. 1969
- Halsband, Robert. The Rape of the Lock and its Illustrations 1714-1896. Oxford, 1980
- Hardman, Phillipa. 'An Addition to Griffith's Bibliography of Pope'. The Library. 5th series, XXXIII (1978), 326-28
- Hart, John A. 'Pope as Scholar-Editor'. Studies in Bibliography. XXIII (1970), 45-59
- Hazen, Allen T. A Catalogue of Horace Walpole's Library. With Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis. Horace Walpole's Library. 3 vols. New Haven, Conn., 1969
- Hernlund, Patricia. 'William Strahan's Ledgers: standard charges for printing, 1738-1785'. Studies in Bibliography. XX (1967), 89-111
- . 'William Strahan's Ledgers II: charges for papers'. Studies in Bibliography. XXII (1969), 179-95
- Hodgson, Norma, and Cyprian Blagden. The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements (1686-1719). Oxford, 1953
- Holmes, Geoffrey. Augustan England: professions, state and society, 1680-1730. 1982

Houlahan, Michael O. 'William Warburton and Tristram Shandy: an ironic source. Notes and Queries. 19 (1972), 378-79

House of Commons Sessional Papers of the Eighteenth Century. ed. Sheila Lambert. vol. 14, George II, Charitable Corporation 1732-1734. Wilmington, Dela., 1975

Howard, William J., ed. Editor, Author, and Publisher. Toronto, 1969

Howson, Gerald. The Macaroni Parson: a life of the unfortunate Dr. Dodd. 1973

\* Leavis, F.R. 'The Dunciad' The Common Pursuit. 1952; rpt 1963, pp. 88-96

Hurd, Richard. The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason. introd. and ed. E.H. Pearce. Cambridge, 1932

Jarrett, Derek. The Ingenious Mr Hogarth. 1976

Johnson, A.F. Selected Essays on Books and Printing. ed. Percy H. Muir. Amsterdam, 1970

Johnson, Samuel. Lives of the English Poets. ed. George Birkbeck Hill. 3 vols. Oxford, 1905

Johnson on Shakespeare. ed. Arthur Sherbo. introd. Bertrand H. Bronson. 2 vols. The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson. gen. eds. A.T. Hazen and J.H. Middendorf. New Haven, Conn., VII-VIII, 1968

Jones, Richard F. Lewis Theobald: his contribution to English scholarship with some unpublished letters. New York, 1919; rpt 1966

Knapp, Elise Ford. 'Learned Colloquy: dynamics of literary form in the work of William Warburton'. Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 1975

Kowalk, Wolfgang. Alexander Pope: an annotated bibliography of twentieth-century criticism 1900-1979. Frankfurt and Bern, 1981 [unseen: see rev. by J. McLaverty, Notes and Queries, 30 (February 1983), 81-82]

[A] Ledger of Charles Ackers. ed. D.F. McKenzie and J.C. Ross. Oxford, 1968

Leigh, Austen. 'William Strahan and his ledgers'. The Library. 4th series, III (1923), 261-87

Leranbaum, Miriam. Alexander Pope's 'Opus Magnum'. Oxford, 1977

The Library

- Lindsay, Jack. 1764: the hurlyburly of daily life exemplified in one year of the eighteenth century, 1959
- Lipking, Lawrence. The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century England. Princeton, 1970
- Lippincott, Louise. Selling Art in Georgian England: the rise of Arthur Pond. New Haven, Conn., 1983 [unseen: see rev. by P. Rogers, Times Literary Supplement (2 December 1983), p. 1337]
- Lockwood, Thomas. Post-Augustan Satire: Charles Churchill and Satirical Poetry 1750-1800. Seattle, 1979
- Lopez, Cecilia. Alexander Pope: an annotated bibliography. Gainesville, Fla., 1969
- Lounsbury, Thomas R. The First Editors of Shakespeare (Pope and Theobald). 1906
- McAleer, John J. 'William Warburton: editor ex cathedra'. Shakespeare Newsletter. 17 (1967), 40
- McCormick, Donald. The Hell-Fire Club: the story of the amorous knights of Wycombe. 1958; rpt 1964
- McDougall, Warren. 'Gavin Hamilton, John Balfour and Patrick Neill: a study of publishing in Edinburgh in the eighteenth century'. University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1974
- . 'Gavin Hamilton, Bookseller in Edinburgh'. BJECS. I, no. 1 (Spring 1978), 1-19
- Mack, Maynard, ed. Essential Articles for the study of Alexander Pope. Hamden, Conn., 1964
- . The Garden and the City: retirement and politics in the later poetry of Pope: 1731-1743. Toronto, 1969
- and James A. Winn, eds. Pope: recent essays by several hands. Hamden, Conn., 1980
- . Collected in Himself: essays critical, biographical, and bibliographical on Pope and some of his contemporaries. Newark, 1982
- McKenzie, D.F. 'Printers of the mind: some notes on Bibliographical theories and printing house practices'. Studies in Bibliography. XXII (1969), 1-75
- . ed. Stationers' Company Apprentices, 1701-1800. Oxford, 1978



- McLavery, James. 'A Study of John Wright and Lawton Gilliver, Alexander Pope's Printer and Bookseller'. B. Litt. thesis, Pembroke College, Oxford, 1974
- . Pope's Printer, John Wright: a preliminary study. Oxford, 1977
- . 'Pope's Horatian Poems: a new variant state'. Modern Philology. 77 (1979), 304-06
- . 'Lawton Gilliver: Pope's bookseller'. Studies in Bibliography. 32 (1979), 101-24
- . 'The first printing and publication of Pope's letters'. The Library. 6th series, II, no. 3 (September 1980), 264-80
- Maresca, Thomas E. Pope's Horatian Poems. Columbus, Ohio, 1966
- Maslen, Keith I.D. 'Works from the Bowyer Press (1713-1765): a supplement to John Nichols'. B.Litt. thesis, Exeter College, Oxford, 1952
- . 'New Editions of Pope's Essay on Man 1745-48' Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America. 62 (1968), 177-88
- . 'Printing for the Author: from the Bowyer printing ledgers, 1710-1775'. The Library. 5th series, XXVI, no. 4 (December 1972), 302-09
- . The Bowyer Ornament Stock. Oxford, 1973
- . 'Printing Charges: Inference and Evidence' Studies in Bibliography. XXIV (1974), 91-98
- Maxted, Ian. The British Book Trades 1710-1777. Exeter, 1983
- Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley. The Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. ed. Robert Halsband. 3 vols. Oxford, 1965-67
- Mossner, E.C. The Life of David Hume. Oxford, 1954; rpt 1970
- Mumby, F.A. Publishing and Bookselling. part I: from the earliest times to 1870. 1930; rpt 1974
- Munby, A.N.L., and Lenore Coral. British Book Sale Catalogues 1676-1800. 1977
- Myers, Robin. The British Book Trade from Caxton to the Present Day. 1973
- New, Melvin. 'Sterne, Warburton, and the Burden of Exuberant Wit'. Eighteenth-Century Studies. 15 (1982), 245-74



Nichol, D.W. 'A Misplaced Plate in Warburton's Pope IV'.  
Notes and Queries. 30 (1983), 34-35

Nichols, John. Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century;  
comprizing biographical memoirs of William Bowyer. 9 vols  
1812-15

———. Illustrations of the Literary History of the  
Eighteenth Century. 8 vols. 1817-58

Nicholson, C.E. 'A World of Artefacts: The Rape of the  
Lock as Social History'. Literature and History.  
5 (Autumn 1979), 183-93

### Notes and Queries

Novak, Maximillian E., ed. English Literature in the Age  
of Disguise. Los Angeles, 1977

Ollman, Nadine. 'William Warburton and eighteenth-century  
criticism'. University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. thesis, 1971

Papali, G.F. Jacob Tonson, Publisher: his life and work  
(1656-1736). Auckland, New Zealand, 1968

[The] Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America

[Pattison, Mark] 'Pope and his Editors'. British Quarterly  
Review. (April 1872), pp. 413-46

Paulson, Ronald. Hogarth: his life, art and times. 2 vols.  
New Haven, Conn., 1971

Peach, R.E.M. The Life and Times of Ralph Allen. 1895

Plant, Marjorie. The English Book Trade. 1974

Plomer, Henry R., G.H. Bushnell and E.R. McC. Dix. A  
Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers who were at work  
in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726-1775. 1932;  
rpt 1968

Pollard, A.W. 'Some Notes on the History of Copyright in  
England, 1662-1774'. The Library. 4th series, III  
(1922-23), 97-114

Pollard, H.G., and A. Ehrman. The Distribution of Books  
by Catalogue to 1800. Cambridge, 1965

Pollard, Graham. 'The English Market for Printed Books'  
Publishing History. IV (1978) 7-48

Porter, Roy. English Society in the Eighteenth Century.  
The Pelican Social History of Britain. 1982

- Prior, Sir James. The Life of Edmond Malone, Editor of Shakespeare. With Selections from his Manuscript Anecdotes. 1860
- Ransom, Harry. 'The Rewards of Authorship in the Eighteenth Century'. Studies in English (1938), 47-66
- Rawson, Claude. 'The work of rehabilitation'. Times Literary Supplement (13 April 1984), p. 412 [rev. of Maynard Mack's Collected in Himself (1982)]
- Richardson, Samuel. Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson. ed. and introd. John Carroll. Oxford, 1964
- Robinson, F.J.G., and P.J. Wallis. Book Subscription Lists: a revised guide. Newcastle, 1975
- Rogers, Pat. The Augustan Vision. 1974
- . An Introduction to Pope. 1975
- . Hacks and Dunces: Pope, Swift and Grub Street. 1972; rev. and abridged 1980
- . 'Pope and his Subscribers'. Publishing History. III (1977), 7-36
- , ed. The Context of English Literature: the eighteenth century. 1978
- . 'Books, Readers and Patrons'. From Dryden to Johnson. ed. Boris Ford. The New Pelican Guide to English Literature. IV, 1982
- Rogers, R.W. 'Notes on Pope's Collaboration with Warburton'. Philological Quarterly. (1947), 358-66
- Rudé, George. Wilkes and Liberty. Oxford, 1962
- Ryley, Robert M. 'William Warburton as Critic and Editor of Pope'. University of Minnesota Ph.D. thesis, 1966
- . William Warburton as "New Critic". Studies in Criticism and Aesthetics, 1660-1800: essays in honour of Samuel Holt Monk. ed. Howard Anderson and John S. Shea. Minneapolis, Minn., 1967, pp. 249-65
- . 'Warburton, Warton, and Ruffhead's Life of Pope.' Papers on Language and Literature. 4 (1968) 51-62
- . 'Did Warburton review Hume's "A Treatise of Human Nature"?'. Notes and Queries. 23 (1976), 354-55
- . 'Pope, Warburton, and the Prince of Wales'. PBSA. 70 (1976), 114-15

- Ryley, Robert M. 'Another Defence by Warburton of the Essay on Man'. Notes and Queries. 26 (1979), 24-25
- Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons. gen. ed. A.N.L. Munby. vol 5: Poets and Men of Letters. ed. Stephen Parks. 1972
- Sale, William M., Jr. Samuel Richardson: Master Printer. Ithaca, N.Y., 1950
- Sedgwick, Romney. The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1715-1754. vol. II, Members E-Y, 1970
- Seymour-Smith, Martin. Poets through their Letters. vol I. 1969
- Sherbo, Arthur. 'Warburton and the 1745 Shakespeare'. Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 51 (1952), 71-82
- Sherburn, George. 'Notes on the Canon of Pope's Works, 1714-1720'. Manly Anniversary Studies. Chicago, 1923, pp. 170-79
- . The Early Career of Alexander Pope. Oxford, 1934; rpt 1968
- Sitwell, Edith. Alexander Pope. 1930
- Smith, David Nichol. Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century. Oxford, 1928
- , ed. Eighteenth-Century Essays on Shakespeare. Oxford, 2nd ed. 1963
- Smith, Raymond J. Charles Churchill. Boston, 1977
- Spence, Joseph. Observations, Anecdotes and Characters of Books and Men collected from observation. ed. James M. Osborn. 2 vols. Oxford, 1966
- Stephen, Leslie. History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century. 2 vols. 1876; rpt 1962
- Sterne, Laurence. The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy Gentleman. ed. Ian Campbell Ross. Oxford, 1983
- . The Letters of Laurence Sterne. ed. L.P. Curtis. Oxford, 1935
- Straus, Ralph. Robert Dodsley: poet, publisher & playwright. 1910; rpt New York, 1968
- . The Unspeakable Curll. 1927
- Studies in Bibliography
- Studies in the Book Trade: in honour of Graham Pollard. Oxford, 1965

- Sykes, N. Church and State in the Eighteenth Century  
Cambridge, 1934
- Tillotson, Geoffrey, Paul Fussell, Jr., and Marshall  
Waingrow, eds. Eighteenth-Century English Literature.  
New York, 1969
- Tobin, James E. Alexander Pope: a list of critical studies  
published from 1895 to 1944. New York, 1945
- Todd, William B. 'Concealed Pope Editions'. Book Collector.  
5 (1956), 48-52
- Tuberville, A.S., ed. Johnson's England. 2 vols. Oxford, 1933
- Vander Meulen, David L. 'Pope's Revisions during Printing:  
a variant section in The Dunciad'. Modern Philology.  
(May 1981), 393-98
- . 'The Printing of Pope's Dunciad, 1728'. Studies  
in Bibliography. XXXV (1982), 271-85
- Vogt, George L., and John Bush Jones, eds. Literary and  
Historical Editing. Lawrence, Kansas, 1981
- Wallis, Philip. At the Sign of the Ship: notes on the House  
of Longman, 1724-1974. Harlow, Essex, 1974
- Walters, Gwyn. 'The Booksellers in 1759 and 1774: the battle  
for literary property'. The Library. 5th series, XXIX  
(1974), 287-311
- [Warburton, William.] An Apology for Sir Robert Sutton. 1733
- . A Critical and Philosophical Commentary on  
Mr. Pope's Essay on Man. 1742
- . A Letter to the Editor of the Letters on the  
Spirit of Patriotism. 1749
- . A Letter from an Author, to a Member of Parlia-  
ment concerning Literary Property. 1748
- . Works. ed. Richard Hurd. 7 vols. 1788
- . Tracts by Warburton and a Warburtonian. ed.  
Samuel Parr. 1789
- . Letters from a late Eminent Prelate. ed.  
Richard Hurd. Kidderminster, 1808
- . A Selection from Unpublished Papers. ed.  
Francis Kilvert. 1841
- Watson, John Selby. The Life of William Warburton D.D.. 1863

Watt, Ian. 'Publishers and Sinners: the Augustan view'.  
Studies in Bibliography. XII (1959), 3-20

Williams, Aubrey. Pope's Dunciad. 1955.

Wimsatt, William Kurtz. The Portraits of Alexander Pope.  
New Haven, 1965

Winn, James Anderson. A Window in the Bosom: the letters  
of Alexander Pope. Hamden, Conn., 1977

\_\_\_\_\_. 'On Pope, Printers, and Publishers'. Eighteenth-  
Century Life. VI (1981), 93-102

Wise, Thomas J., comp. A Pope Library. 1931; rpt with introd.  
by K.I.D. Maslen, 1973

Wright, Austin. Joseph Spence: a critical biography.  
Chicago, 1950

[The] Year's Work in English Studies

\* \* \* \* \*



A Closing Note on the Knaptons and the ESTC

Bibliographical resources in the eighteenth century have never been better. With Foxon's English Verse 1701-1750, Alston and Jannetta's Machine-Readable Cataloguing of the British Library Pope holdings and, now, the microfiche Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue (which has become available for use in the National Library of Scotland within the past month), book-trade studies will benefit immensely.

My trial-run on BLAISE (the British Library's ominous acronym for its omnifarious computer) produced some amazingly instant results. As the programmers had the foresight to include imprints in their cataloguing, scholars now have complete figures for publishers at their fingertips. Using, in my own case, the 'database' KNAPTON, I discovered that the ESTC contains 1536 entries. (This, of course, includes James, John and Paul in all their variations as well as any other 'Knapton'.) Narrowing it down further we discover:

1357	items before 1750
157	items from 1750-1760
<u>22</u>	items from 1761-1770
1536	total

From these figures we can well see that the Knaptons hit their peak well before the 1751 Pope edition. Unlike the Longman and Rivington dynasties, the Knapton line faded not long after their association with Warburton. At least, with Pope's Works and Johnson's Dictionary, they left in a blaze of glory.



